LEEDS STUDIES IN ENGLISH

New Series
Volume XIII
1982

Edited by
ELIZABETH WILLIAMS

THE UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS
SCHOOL OF ENGLISH

COPYRIGHT 1982
SCHOOL OF ENGLISH
UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

Printed in Great Britain by
The Moxon Press Ltd
122 Bolling Road, Ben Rhydding,
Ilkley, West Yorks.

CONTENTS

page

Halldór Laxness and the Icelandic Sagas
PETER HALLBERG 1

Ælfric's Longer *Life of St Martin* and its Latin Sources:
A Study in Narrative Technique JUDITH GAITES 23

The Wife of Bath and her Tale N.F. BLAKE 42

Streams and Swamps in the *Gawain* Country
RALPH W.V. ELLIOTT 56

Kingship in the Chester Nativity Play RUTH M. KEANE 74

"This Vague Relation": Historical Fiction and
Historical Veracity in the Later Middle Ages
RUTH MORSE 85

Wyatt and Chaucer: A Re-Appraisal HELEN COOPER 104

The *De Analogia Anglicani Sermonis* of Thomas Tonkis
ALBERT B. COOK III 125

HALLDÓR LAXNESS AND THE ICELANDIC SAGAS

The text of a lecture given in honour of Bogi Th. Melsteð
in the School of English, University of Leeds, 2 March 1981.

By PETER HALLBERG

(i)

In *Íslendíngaspjall* [An Essay on Icelanders], a little book dating from 1967, Halldór Laxness expresses his regret that Icelandic authors no longer write in the grand style of classical Icelandic literature. The heavens do not arch so high and bright over their work, he claims, once it has begun to adjust to the demands of a Christmas market aimed at a not very fastidious audience. However, the standard set by the Golden Age, as Laxness names it, is still influential among Icelandic critics, and that to such an extent that

> such poor wretches as myself and people like me, who are now toiling at writing books, often feel out of place in this country, when any downright rogue can prove beyond dispute that we are worse writers of prose than the men who produced *Njals saga* or *Hrafnkels saga* or *Heimskringla*; and similarly, that as poets we have declined considerably since the tenth century, when the author of *Völuspá* stood beneath this vast sky of Iceland, and could not spell his name.[1]

Laxness is exaggerating, of course. In general he loves to express himself pointedly and paradoxically; it is something of an artistic principle with him. When he wrote the words just quoted, his status as one of the foremost prose writers of our time was undisputed. Twelve years earlier he had been awarded the Nobel Prize. He had little need to feel the pressure of the Icelandic tradition weighing too heavily upon him.

An exaggeration, certainly, but one containing a hard core of truth. As a matter of fact it is not easy for a foreigner to imagine what their great literary heritage has meant to the Icelanders. We are not dealing here with an isolated literary element, or a speciality for scholars and writers. Through the ages and up to our own century Medieval Icelandic literature has profoundly influenced the thought-patterns and ideals of the Icelandic people as a whole. The language itself has played an important part as a connecting link between the past and the present. As is

well-known, Icelandic has remained surprisingly unchanged throughout the centuries, to a far greater extent than the other Scandinavian languages. An Icelandic child of the present time who has learnt to read is equipped to make his own acquaintance with the sagas of Njáll or Egill Skallagrímsson. The Icelandic landscape, too, makes its inhabitants feel the presence of their ancient literature in a wholly unique way. An Icelandic farmer, wherever he lives, is surrounded by places and place-names reminding him of men and episodes in the sagas. The glorious past still lives on for every Icelander who at any time may wish to make contact with it. This unbroken tradition, with its fascinating memories of their ancestors and their lives, has also been a powerful support to the Icelanders in their long struggle for national independence. In periods of weakness and humiliation it offered them an ideal and an unfailing source of strength.

For centuries the Icelanders had assimilated their national heritage of ancient poetry and sagas as a matter of course, without thinking much about its presence or its importance. It surrounded them imperceptibly and inevitably like the very air they breathed. Today, however, the situation has changed. In the twentieth century, Iceland has experienced a radical development in material and social spheres, like other countries in Western Europe. But in the Saga Island, with its unique cultural heritage, this development involved an almost revolutionary change. The Icelandic farming community, which had in essential respects remained relatively stable since the Middle Ages, now underwent a metamorphosis into a modern welfare state in just a few decades. In such a period of ferment as that of the two world wars, Icelanders could not avoid becoming especially aware of their ancient culture, which could no longer be assimilated merely unconsciously. The native Icelandic tradition became a problem to face and consider, at least for more observant and thoughtful citizens.

Halldór Laxness has lived through this revolutionary development from its very beginnings. He was born in 1902, and is thus a contemporary of the present century. His work may be seen, to a greater or lesser degree, as a running commentary on Icelandic culture and Icelandic literary tradition. At the height of his career he once said, as an explanation of why as a layman he had undertaken to write a long essay on the Icelandic sagas: "My main excuse for these notes is that an Icelandic author cannot live without constantly having the ancient books in his thoughts."[2]

(ii)

In a short autobiographical work dating from 1924, when Halldór was twenty-two years old, he tells us of his maternal grandmother - as he has in fact often done since. This old woman, who was born in 1832, obviously made a deep impression on her grandson:

> But it was my grandmother who brought me up as a child, and I am proud of having been brought up by a woman who, of all the women I have known, was the least

> dependent on the fashion and spirit of the times. She sang me ancient songs before I could talk, told me stories from heathen times and sang me cradle songs from the Catholic era. . . .
>
> Her speech was pure and strong and there was never a false note in the language she spoke. I have never known anything more authentically Icelandic than the language of this old woman. . . . It was the language of the culture, eight hundred years old, of the inland farms of Iceland, unspoilt and wonderful, imbued with the indefinable flavour of its origin, like a wild fruit.[3]

Perhaps this portrait of his grandmother is somewhat archaized; perhaps his creative imagination has over-stressed the old-fashioned elements of his upbringing. But there can be little doubt that the portrait gives, on the whole, a true idea of how, in this old woman, the boy experienced his country's past as something still present and living.

His first conscious reaction to the great literary heritage of Iceland seems, on the other hand, to have been rather negative. Soon after the end of the First World War, in 1919, the seventeen-year-old Halldór broke off his schooling in Reykjavík High School and went abroad to see the world. In the next few years he lived in different European countries. For some time he stayed as a guest at the Benedictine monastery of St Maurice de Clervaux in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. In January 1923 he was baptized and confirmed there in the Catholic faith, by the Bishop of Luxembourg himself. He evidently had various plans for the future at that time, but first and foremost his ambition was to become an author - though certainly not in the spirit of the Icelandic tradition.

His literary ideal gradually developed in a direction quite contrary to the ideals of Old Icelandic culture. The experience he accumulated during his years of travelling and learning in postwar Europe made him decide to become "a modern man". This was the catchword of the time, and of course it was bound to mark his own literary tastes and aspirations. In April 1923 he wrote a letter from the monastery to his friend Einar Ólafur Sveinsson, who was at that time a university student in Copenhagen and who was later to become a renowned saga scholar. Einar had sent him Snorri Sturluson's *Heimskringla*, urging him not to lose his feeling for his mother tongue in his foreign surroundings. When Halldór had finished reading it he wrote back the following comment on "Snorri and those old Icelandic books in general":

> And all I can say is this: Heu mihi, I have nothing to learn from them! Those old fogeys lay the greatest stress on the very thing that modern authors lay least stress on - *namely, on the drawing of contours.* They are all occupied in gathering together a few deadly boring facts, of no concern to anybody. . . .
>
> The language of this Snorri may not be so bad as far as it goes, and is good Icelandic. . . . But as

> I say, it moves in territories quite different from those of our language, and the man [Snorri] thinks with a brain quite differently structured from that of a modern man, and is interested in events and things quite different from those which excite our interest today (he is greatly interested, for example, in whether some king gives a man a cloak or a ring).
> On the whole, I do not think it is possible to learn to write Modern Icelandic from Old Icelandic; something else is needed.[4]

Contours and facts - that is to say, the sober objectivity of the sagas and their want of psychological analysis, which make them, in Laxness's view, unfit to teach him anything as a modern author. His attack on classical Icelandic prose is only one aspect of this young iconoclast's revolt against native Icelandic tradition and conditions in his country as a whole. He wanted to make room for youth and for the new ideas of his age. He felt the current situation to be stagnant and old-fashioned under the paralysing pressure of the past. With polemical impatience he was giving his sleeping fellow-countrymen a good shaking up, and did not spare his ammunition.

His greatest literary achievement from these years, the novel *Vefarinn mikli frá Kasmír* [The Great Weaver from Kashmir], was published in the spring of 1927. This work very consistently implies an abrupt break with the native Icelandic tradition of narrative art. The story is freely subjective; its rhythm varies like an unstable temperature curve. The principal character, the young Icelandic poet Steinn Elliði, who shares many essential experiences with his author, engages the reader in a whirl of often paradoxical and conflicting ideas. He certainly satisfies Halldór's own concept of "a modern man". At one point Steinn Elliði characterizes himself as follows:

> I am the living embodiment of the human type which has seen the light of day in the last ten or twelve years, and never existed before. More precisely: I am an Icelandic Western European steeped in the spirit of the times, which have sent world history to the gallows; my thought is as free as that of a person who might have fallen down from the stars in August of the year 1914 . . . A writer who has grown up out of a continuous tradition with its roots deep down in the culture of ancient Greece has no more in common with me than Neanderthal man, for instance, or fossilized ferns from the prehistory of the earth. . . . It would never occur to me to quote from a book written before 1914 . . .[5]

A more violent reaction against tradition and the "old fogeys" can hardly be imagined. With this juvenile outburst, however, a phase in Halldór's personal development was coming to an end, even though the work of his literary breakthrough contains virtually

all the germs of his later writings. For in spite of all its dialectics and oscillations, his literary production shows throughout a striking continuity.

(iii)

After publishing *The Great Weaver*, Laxness spent a couple of years, from May 1927 to the end of 1929, in the United States, mostly in California. He was anxious to become acquainted with this, the most modern country in the world. He was interested in, among other things, the film industry, and had certain plans to write for this up-to-date medium. His experiences in these years, when he witnessed the development of the great world depression in America, made his political thinking more radical. Laxness became a socialist, though a rather unorthodox one. But more important from our present point of view is the fact that in the United States he became intensely aware of his Icelandic cultural heritage. The collection of essays entitled *Alþýðubókin* [The Book of the People], published in 1929, may be seen as the most important literary production of his years in America. His newly acquired socialist convictions permeate its motley content. But the work is also imbued with an equally strong patriotic enthusiasm. Laxness speaks of the decline of the West in prophetic turns of phrase which reveal the influence of the German philosopher Oswald Spengler. However, the decline of the West has nothing to do with Iceland, he maintains. His pride in his native country rises to a climax in the following passage:

> The nation with the oldest civilized language in Europe, and the oldest continuous history, is now awakening as the youngest civilized nation in our part of the world. . . . The people slept among the mountains which teemed with elves and supernatural beings, and in this virgin landscape, where every valley is a memory from our history, every desolate scene a symbol of our most mystical perceptions - there we rise up today as newborn people, gifted with the pristine freshness of the child of nature, with the language of the gods on our lips and the morning sky above us blazing with prophecies and signs.[6]

The Icelanders have their own ideals, and need not borrow them from abroad. The Icelandic sagas are their Old Testament, we are told, the Poetic Edda is their Song of Songs, "and we call our great men heroes, not prophets."[7] Laxness, who five years earlier had written rather disdainfully of the "old fogeys", with their contours and barren facts, now refers to the unknown author of *Njáls saga* as the equal of Dante, Michelangelo, Bach and Goethe. Being a citizen of the world, he says, is not a question of wearing one's shoes out in twenty countries and learning to converse in ten different languages; it means being a true son of one's own nation. "God wants me to be an Icelander," Laxness asserts.[8] What this amounts to is a straightforward revaluation of the Icelandic heritage. Laxness now knows for certain that his work has its roots in

Icelandic soil. In the thirties he devotes himself resolutely to the description of contemporary life in Iceland in a series of great novels. But only gradually does the influence of the sagas and the typically Icelandic prose tradition become apparent.

(iv)

Of this tradition very little is noticeable in the first novel after his return from America, *Salka Valka* (1931-32).[9] It is set in an Icelandic fishing-village, where the modern age, with the labour movement and strikes, begins to influence people's lives. Allusions to the ancient literature occur only in comic episodes. The old heroic ideal and stubborn individualism are invoked by the conservatives as an antidote to the radical tide. If people were no longer willing to work for the pay decided on by the patriarchal merchant - then, as the author ironically comments,

> the native country was at stake, the freedom of the nation and the initiative of the individual, which has been the most sacred inheritance of our noble race from time immemorial, when stony-broke chieftains sailed their ships to England, slaughtered infants there, raped women, and stole cows.[10]

A man who refuses to accept an allowance from the strike fund is characterized as "a brave sailor, well-read in the Icelandic sagas and devoted to the heroic spirit."[11] On this occasion it turns out that, on the whole, many workers have a genuine feeling for independence. They want "to live and die by themselves, like wild-cats."[12] "What they cannot endure is a humiliation contrary to the heroic deeds of their forefathers and the spirit of the Icelandic sagas."[13] Thus in *Salka Valka* the spirit of the sagas is seen satirically as a sign of a reactionary nationalistic ideology. This attitude seems to contrast somewhat sharply with the extraordinarily positive assessment of the saga tradition in *Alþýðubókin*. A certain ambivalence on Laxness's part must here be taken into account. In the novel, Laxness is obviously satirizing a comic and dubious misuse of the sagas for practical, political ends.

Laxness's next work, an epic novel about farmers with the ironic title *Sjálfstætt fólk* [Independent People, 1934-35], has much more of the "saga mind" behind it than *Salka Valka*. It is true that the small farmer, Bjartur, its main character, does not fight with sword and spear, but he possesses in large measure the toughness and unyielding courage of the ancient heroes. In his brutally hard struggle against inexorable natural forces and adverse circumstances in society, he braces himself by singing some *rímur*, the name given to those unique and extensive ballad-poems which have been cultivated in Iceland from the fourteenth century down to the present time. They often deal with the same material as the sagas. In Bjartur's view Christian prayers and hymns are an artistically inferior and lax type of poetry in comparison with the rigorously constructed domestic type, of which he is such a devotee. On the whole Laxness

has succeeded in conjuring up the life of the nation over a thousand years as an impressive background to the novel, and weaving it into Bjartur's own life and destiny. He thus creates a kind of timelessness, or perhaps the quality of "epic time", as he has since, in another context, called it.[14]

The tetralogy which was later to become known as *Heimsljós* [World Light, 1937-40] seems at first sight very remote from the world and spirit of the Icelandic sagas.[15] Its main character, the parish pauper Ólafur Kárason, is with his gentleness and defencelessness the very opposite of Bjartur. And the style of the novel is more subjective and lyrical than any other prose work of Laxness. Even so, there are some firm connections here with the sagas and the Icelandic literary tradition in general. Ólafur is a folk-poet, who tirelessly continues his writing in the face of almost incredible difficulties. Among his fellow human-beings this browbeaten poet is certainly no hero. At his writing-desk, however, with pen in hand, he undergoes a kind of transformation:

> It never happened that he was partial in his narrative; he never passed moral judgment on a deed or its perpetrator - any more than Snorri Sturluson does in telling of the exploits of kings and gods. In the stories written by this man, who himself was incapable of harming the tiniest creature, no offence taken at so-called evil deeds ever showed through; he would tell a story only for the reason that something seemed to him worth telling. . . . In his role as writer, he was quite different from the humble devotee of general average behaviour who was seen in the daytime to be quite prepared to bend to the will of anyone he met.[16]

Thus an Icelandic folk-poet at the turn of the century acknowledges the objective style of writing characteristic of the sagas. It is significant that this kind of prose goes together with an attitude of moral impartiality.

(v)

It is not until the trilogy *Íslandsklukkan* [The Bell of Iceland, 1943-46] that the saga inheritance manifests itself with full force. The story of this historical novel had been in the author's mind for many years, but it was composed during the Second World War, and clearly bears the mark of its time of composition. These years were a turning-point in the history of Iceland. It is true that Iceland was only peripherally affected by the war itself: British and later American troops were sent there in defence of this important European outpost in the Atlantic. But the nation was now also faced with the decision finally to dissolve the personal union with Denmark. Before the war had yet come to an end, on June 17, 1944, the new republic was proclaimed at the ancient meeting-place of the *alþingi*, Þingvellir. Full national independence, which had been

lost almost seven hundred years earlier, was thus regained.

This event was accompanied by a strong upsurge of Icelandic national feeling, providing an obvious reason for calling attention to the native cultural heritage. *Íslandsklukkan* captures this atmosphere brilliantly. The author, who with his sometimes caustic satire of Icelandic society had been a rather controversial figure among his fellow-countrymen, now became, for many Icelanders, something of a Poet Laureate. Laxness found the subject matter for his novel in the history of Iceland at the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth, a period of great decline and humiliation for the Icelandic people. The main theme of the story is an authentic legal case, concerning the small farmer, Jón Hreggviðsson, who is accused of murdering the Danish hangman in Iceland. After a lifelong struggle against the authorities both in his native country and in Denmark, he is at last found not guilty, as an old man. Around these events the author has drawn a magnificent and vivid all-round picture of the period.

Here, for the first time in his works of fiction, Laxness has utilized the saga tradition in a profound and consistent way. He set to work very well prepared for the task. In the early forties, before and during the composition of the novel, he was intensely preoccupied with the sagas. Indeed, he published in modern Icelandic spelling three of the most famous saga texts, namely *Laxdæla saga* (1941), *Hrafnkels saga* (1942) and *Njáls saga* (1945); and in articles and speeches from these years Laxness again and again emphasizes the significance of the saga tradition for Icelandic national feeling. In particular, a long essay dating from 1945, "Minnisgreinar um fornsögur" [Notes on the sagas], presents viewpoints which shed valuable light on his new novel.[17]

Laxness strongly emphasizes that the Icelandic sagas of the thirteenth century are quite different in character from contemporary European literature. They show a greater proximity to reality, so to speak, a closer connection between referent and word. The interest is focused on reality itself rather than on the cause of this reality, i.e. God. And this, according to the theology of the time, is blasphemy - or so Laxness says.

Although at the time of saga-writing the Icelanders had been Christian for centuries, the sagas are, according to Laxness, surprisingly untouched by Christian ideals. They are the most heathen literature of Europe, he maintains. He admits that the influence of Christianity may be traced in certain episodes. The sagas reveal no pronounced hostility towards Christianity, rather a kind of benevolence, quite free from fanaticism. But that, in Laxness's view, is merely "surface Christianity". On a deeper level the two elements, heathen and Christian, run side by side, in the same stream, but are as incompatible with each other as cold water and molten lead. Further, the philosophy of the sagas is marked by a completely un-Christian belief in Fate. From that perspective all moral judgments on the saga characters become almost absurd. It is Fate that brings about a man's ruin, not his sins or God's punishment. In the world of the sagas forces hold sway which Laxness has labelled with the Latin word *inexorabilia*, the inexorable. One can

thus speak of a kind of amoralism or moral pessimism in the sagas. Their style, too, is adapted to this conception of life. The saga writer does not open his heart to us. His language is completely subordinated to the subject-matter of the story; he models it with ascetic self-discipline.

Laxness ends his reflections on the sagas by reminding us of their importance to the Icelanders as a nation. To them the heroic ideal has not been, and still is not, an empty concept. The belief in the hero who defies wounds and death has sustained the Icelandic people through the centuries. "The saga was our invincible fortress, and it is thanks to the saga that we are today a free nation."[18] This essay, which was published while the author was putting the finishing touches to *Íslandsklukkan*, may to some extent be read as a commentary on his novel. It gives an idea of the light in which he saw the sagas during his work on the trilogy.[19]

The influence of the sagas on *Íslandsklukkan* may be viewed from at least three points of view. In the first place the saga tradition appears as the mainspring of the national self-confidence and power of resistance with which the trilogy is largely concerned. Secondly, the author has, perhaps rather surprisingly, represented the ancient tension between heathen and Christian principles as still active. Thirdly, it is clear that the style of the work has been consciously adapted to that of the sagas. These three aspects are by no means independent of each other.

The relationship of the main characters of the novel to the native Icelandic tradition emerges in various ways and on different levels. The small farmer Jón Hreggviðsson represents the ordinary, poor country people of Iceland. He is engaged in a stubborn struggle against the authorities, with the death penalty hanging over his head. He confronts the difficulties besetting him by singing in a loud voice the old-fashioned popular poems named *Pontusrímur*, grinning with his white teeth like a dog at his adversaries and tormentors. During his stay in Denmark Jón is forced to join the Danish mercenary army. Because of a minor offence - the thrashing of an arrogant army cook - he is court-martialled. Before the court he has to listen to the most amazing accusations from the presiding colonel against Icelanders in general. But when the assisting officer asks him if the accusations are not well-founded, Jón straightens his back and replies: "My forefather Gunnar of Hlíðarendi was twelve ells tall." And when he is threatened with being broken on the wheel if he should be lying, he repeats and develops his description: "Twelve ells. I'm not taking that back. He lived to be three hundred years of age. And wore a band of gold about his forehead. The sound of his spear was the most beautiful song ever heard in the North."[20] The fame of his forefathers, the heroes of the sagas - this heritage cannot be taken away from Jón Hreggviðsson. In a hostile environment, in a situation of the utmost danger and humiliation, he finds support and solace in the saga tradition in an unsophisticated and palpable way. It is an episode where Laxness characteristically intertwines humour with pathos.

The leading female character of *Islandsklukkan* is Snæfríður

Björnsdóttir, daughter of the highest-ranking legal official in Iceland. Like Jón she embodies much of the cultural heritage of the nation, but she does so in a more conscious, more literary manner. Her father is dismissed from office because of supposed breaches of duty. After his death she sets out for Denmark to try to obtain a retrial and so clear her dead father's name. She is given an audience by the Governor of Iceland, Gyldenlöve. Face to face with this Danish nobleman, who knows nothing of Iceland and has no understanding of Icelanders, she at last makes a fervent appeal, where her pride in the history and culture of Iceland rises to an impassioned climax:

> Our poets were making songs and telling stories in the language of the king from Ásgarður, Óðinn himself, while Europe was still speaking the language of slaves. Where are the songs, where are the sagas, that you Danes composed? Even your own ancient heroes were brought to life by the Icelanders in our books. . . . Forgive my talking like this, forgive the fact that we are a saga people and can forget nothing.[21]

And she concludes by referring to a famous passage in *Hávamál*:

> We Icelanders are certainly not too good to die. And for a long time life has been of no value to us. There is one thing only which we cannot lose as long as one member of this nation, be he rich or poor, remains alive; not even after death can we be without it; and that is the thing which is mentioned in the ancient poem, and which we call fame.[22]

The widest coverage of the history and culture of Iceland, however, is given to the third main character of the novel, Arnas Arnæus. The historical prototype for him is the famous Icelandic scholar and manuscript-collector Árni Magnússon (1663-1730), whose bequest of books and manuscripts to the University of Copenhagen has become known as the Arnamagnean Collection. At a big festival at the royal court in Copenhagen Arnas has a conversation with a delegate from the city of Hamburg, a businessman named Uffelen. The Danish government is planning to sell Iceland to Hamburg, and Uffelen now brings up this business deal for discussion with Arnas Arnæus. In the event of such a transaction prominent people in Hamburg will require an Icelandic representative on the island, and have thought of Arnæus for this purpose. When Arnas has listened to Uffelen's argument, he remains silent for a while. Then he begins his answer by describing a voyage over the North Sea to Iceland, until suddenly "storm-lashed mountains" and "glacier peaks wrapped in stormy clouds" rise out of "a troubled sea".[23] The delegate from Hamburg does not quite understand what the Icelander is driving at:

> "There is no sight more ominously powerful than Iceland rising out of the sea," said Arnas Arnæus.
> "Well, I don't know about that," said the German

> rather wonderingly.
> "That sight alone gives the key to the mystery of how the greatest books in the whole of Christendom came to be written here," said Arnas Arnæus.
> "Well, what of it?" said the German.
> "I know that you realize now," said Arnas Arnæus, "that it is not possible to buy Iceland."[24]

Once more, then, the ancient books embody the spirit of the nation, its past, its present, and its future. It may be assumed, incidentally, that when Laxness created this scene, he was thinking of a burning national question of the day. At the end of the Second World War the United States of America asked to take a long lease on two military bases in Iceland. This request kindled a bitter political feud among the Icelanders. Laxness vehemently opposed such an agreement with the United States; according to him it would mean nothing less than selling Iceland - just after it had at last regained full national independence.

As pointed out earlier, Laxness in his long essay on the sagas strongly emphasizes the non-Christian and to some extent amoral attitude of this literature. A similar attitude also characterizes the three main figures of *Íslandsklukkan* in different ways - despite the fact that the period was otherwise dominated by a strictly orthodox Lutheran church.

With Jón Hreggviðsson there is hardly any question of morality at all. This poor farmer in his struggle for survival cannot afford such a luxury. Circumstances have forced upon him a cynicism free from all illusions. When he listens to talk of the necessity for repentance, he remarks that it is not because of their lack of repentance that the Icelanders have fallen on evil days, for when did Gunnar of Hlíðarendi ever repent? Answer: never. According to Jón, the lack of fishing tackle has been far more harmful to the Icelandic people than the lack of a repentant disposition. The concept of sin is completely alien to him:

> "Sins!" said Jón Hreggviðsson and flared up. "I have never committed any sins. I am an honest, large-scale criminal."[25]

Snæfríður seems to be astonishingly unaffected by Christianity, although she is a close relative of the Bishop and his wife, and although her teacher is the Dean himself. "My happiness is not prescribed by prayer-books,"[26] she says to her pious sister, the Bishop's wife. Her conversations with the Dean are especially informative. When he instructs her on repentance and punishment, she rejects his teachings impatiently: "Let us leave all foolishness aside!" she says.[27] In the scenes between them one remembers what Laxness says of heathen and Christian elements in the sagas: they are as incompatible as cold water and molten lead. The Dean, for his part, is well aware of the origin of the young woman's mentality: "I have always known that the poetic language of your forbears is of heathen origin."[28]

As a man of learning Arnas Arnæus has pondered questions of

ethics and morality to a greater extent than Jón or Snæfríður. But he, too, stands at a rather far remove from Christian doctrine. He is a sceptical man of the world, who looks at things from more than one angle. When, in the course of a conversation on the Pope and Martin Luther, the Bishop's wife asks him if there are two kinds of truth, one for the South and another for the North, he answers with a similitude: "There is a mountain in Kinn in northern Iceland. It is named Bakrángi if you look at it from the east, and Ógaungufjall if you are in the west, but from out in Skjálfandi bay seafarers call it Galti."[29] Such an answer shows his relativism. In moral and ethical matters Arnas Arnæus reveals an almost legalistic attitude. "Nothing has happened if it cannot be proved," he says on one occasion.[30] As is well known, the legal aspect of human life plays a prominent part in the sagas.

It is wholly consistent with the three main characters' view of life that both Arnas and Snæfríður seem to believe, to a greater or lesser extent, in the inexorability of fate. At the end of *Íslandsklukkan* it is as if we see the *inexorabilia* - as Laxness characterizes the philosophy of *Njáls saga* - coming into their own. From the very beginning of his work on the trilogy he had thought of using the word *inexorabilia* as the title of its second volume.

As a "historical" novel *Íslandsklukkan* presented its author with certain problems of style. He needed a touch of archaism. The many contemporary sources he used supplied much of his material for various episodes and conversations, but the most important general prototypes for the narrative art of his novel were the sagas themselves. Laxness referred to their style in a newspaper interview (in *Þjóðviljinn*, December 23, 1944), when the second volume of the trilogy had just been published. Here he contrasts the "objective" prose of the sagas with the "subjective" art of later periods. The "objective" language keeps, on the whole, to the external appearance of things, to what can be seen and heard, people's actions and words. It offers no reports of thoughts and feelings, no "stream of consciousness".

Laxness finds a point of contact here with modern psychology. Behaviourism, he observes, confines itself to studying what can be objectively verified. He also notices a certain affinity between the prose of the sagas and Hemingway's style, and had, incidentally, translated *A Farewell to Arms* into Icelandic in 1941.[31] He is, however, well aware of an essential difference between Hemingway and the sagas, and describes it thus:

> A hundred years ago sentimentality was in fashion among the Romanticists. Now it is fashionable to employ a kind of sarcasm instead of sentimentality. But that is in fact only the reverse of sentimentality, a denial of it. I have been trying to train myself to avoid both, to get onto a level removed from that way of thinking, and to see things from without instead of from within.[32]

Now *Íslandsklukkan* is certainly no saga pastiche. Laxness has

skilfully adapted the narrative art and style of the sagas to his own purposes. He is obviously laying considerable stress here on what he had once impatiently dismissed as characteristic of the "old fogeys": their care in the "drawing of contours". Many descriptions in the novel reveal a predilection for contours, for a sober and objective report of what can be seen. The episode when Jón Hreggviðsson is publicly whipped by the hangman is a case in point:

> Jón Hreggviðsson did not flinch at the first lashes, but at the fourth and fifth his body contracted convulsively, so that it rose up at both ends, and the legs, the face and the upper part of the chest arched above the ground, while his weight rested on his stretched abdomen. His fists clenched themselves, his feet were stretched at the ankles, his joints stiffened and his muscles hardened; it could be seen from his soles that his shoes were newly repaired.[33]

(vi)

However, Laxness was to penetrate still further into the saga tradition. After an interlude with *Atómstöðin* [The Atom Station, 1948], where he flung himself straight into the harrowing political disputes in Iceland at the end of the war, including the question of "selling" the country to the United States, he turned again to the sagas, with *Gerpla* [The Happy Warriors, 1952]. Here we apprehend the sagas not merely as an undercurrent, for Laxness uses two ancient texts, *Fóstbræðra saga* and Snorri Sturluson's *Ólafs saga helga*, as foundations on which to build his new novel. This time Laxness aims at writing a real Icelandic saga. The narrator adopts the role of a medieval saga man seeking to reproduce a story already known, though with new insights. To this end he has created his own saga language by taking over many words, turns of phrase and constructions from the sagas themselves. But this language naturally has its own special qualities also. It is more supple than its saga prototype, and richer in shades of meaning. As far as I can see, it is unique among the many attempts that have been made in this direction.

As is to be expected, the new work reflects our own time, in spite of its heavily archaized style. The author has his own urgent message to convey. During the years when Laxness was working on his novel, he was deeply involved in the so-called World Peace Movement. At the time of the cold war between the superpowers, under the shadow of the atom bomb, he often published articles and gave lectures on the theme of peace and war, in a radical, socialist spirit. *Gerpla* can be seen as the artistic expression of these ideas. Laxness is here subjecting the old heroic ideal to caustic satire. For this purpose *Fóstbræðra saga* must have been an especially rewarding source. It is distinguished from most other sagas by the fact that one of its two main characters, Þorgeir Hávarsson, appears - though probably unintentionally from its author's point of view - as a thoroughly repellent representative of the heroic ideal, to such an

extent that, for the modern reader at least, the story can lapse into grim comedy. This young man and his companion, the well-known poet Þormóður Bessason, nicknamed Kolbrúnarskáld, are the principal characters of the novel.

The story is set at the beginning of the eleventh century. The Iceland of that time is described in *Gerpla* as having a Christian and relatively peaceful peasant society. But the two young men, Þorgeir and Þormóður, have from early childhood been listening enthusiastically to all kinds of poems and stories about heroes, valkyries, great battles, etc. and they have, unfortunately, become somewhat intoxicated by this spiritual nourishment. In an anachronistic manner, like Don Quixote, they adopt in all seriousness extremely old-fashioned ideas and attitudes, and are firmly resolved to realize the Viking style in their own lives. Their philosophy, if it may be so called, is dominated by three embodiments of that ideal: the warrior-hero; the poet who praises the hero in immortal songs; and the Viking leader and king, to whom they both swear allegiance.

After Þorgeir and Þormóður have become sworn brothers - by a ridiculous ceremonial involving the mingling of blood under frozen turves, which provokes sarcastic comments from the bystanders - they obtain a miserable little boat, and in this caricature of a Viking ship proceed to raid the north-west coast of Iceland, with the intention of robbing small farmers of their treasures, and in the hope of finding other heroes to engage with them in fights to the death. A parody of a Viking expedition, in fact.

At last the two companions part, and Þorgeir goes abroad to enter the service of the far-distant, much-admired king. The king in question is Ólafur Haraldsson, who later came to be known as Saint Ólafur. But for the time being he is a far from saintly figure, raiding in Europe as a Viking chieftain and leading a group of mercenaries. We follow Þorgeir on his travels and are given a view of contemporary conditions in different countries. Laxness describes with biting irony how the rulers regard the ordinary people in their own countries as their most dangerous enemies, and are always prepared to buy assistance from abroad in suppressing them. And when he shows how church leaders lend the authority of the Christian faith to all kinds of war crimes, one cannot help thinking of Laxness's vehement polemics against Archbishop Fisher of Canterbury. He was indignant because the Archbishop did not condemn the use of the atom bomb unconditionally - which was a main desideratum in the programme of the World Peace Movement. There is nothing far-fetched about this connection; on the contrary, there are notes on Archbishop Fisher in the manuscripts of *Gerpla*.[34]

In these foreign surroundings the primitive Icelander Þorgeir appears as an almost harmless, though ridiculous figure, with his brutal and rigid, but comparatively honest, heroic ideal. A speech made by Laxness in the summer of 1952, the year that *Gerpla* was published, shows a certain sympathy for the old domestic type of hero, when compared with the mechanized war experts of our own time:

> We Icelanders are peaceful farmers and fishermen,

> and the heroes whom we revere in ancient lays have nothing in common with the heroes of modern armies who are most effective in annihilating unarmed people with atom bombs, napalm bombs and other instruments of wholesale murder, but who are otherwise ill-suited for warfare.[35]

The criticism of the warlike ideal in *Gerpla* is obviously aimed at our own time just as much as, or more than, at the saga age itself. We can hardly be mistaken if we read this story as a condemnation of the romanticism attached in later times to "germanisches Heldentum", and the like. Of Þorgeir we are told that he would be given iron by other men of the household in exchange for his weekly ration of butter, because he found it unmanly (*lítilmannlegt*) to eat butter: "Iron is more to our taste," he says.[36] This, of course, is a comical and relatively innocent echo of Hermann Goering's notorious slogan about guns before butter. The author has clearly set out to make a clean sweep of what he regards as a misuse, at once naïve and dangerous, of his country's glorious literary inheritance.

Paradoxically enough, however, it turns out that Stiklastaðir and King Ólafur's fall in battle against the Norwegian peasant army does not imply merely the collapse of an ideal of heroism and conquest, which is both sterile and inimical to human life. In fact, the belief of the sworn brothers in Ólafur Haraldsson's greatness is not altogether mistaken. For this king was to win, as Saint Ólafur, as much praise in heaven as on earth. Yet to none has he become so dear as to Icelandic skalds, "as is shown by the fact that never in the world has there been written a book about kings, not even about Christ Himself, which even halfway compares with that which Snorri the Learned has written, and which is called the saga of Saint Ólafur."[37] And of Þormóður we read: "But Icelandic saga writers have clothed with honour the death of Þormóður Kolbrúnarskáld at Stiklastaðir in immortal books, to the end that the fame of the skald should live as long as that of the king whom he sought and found."[38]

In literary documents both king and skald shine with the glory denied them by life. Thus *Gerpla* may also be read as a eulogy of classical Icelandic literature, and as a reminder that life and literature are two different things.

(vii)

A closer approximation to the Icelandic sagas than *Gerpla* can hardly be conceived. Perhaps such a novel represents, in a way, a kind of blind alley. It is certainly a remarkable artistic achievement, but it may also seem somewhat artificial.

However this may be, the sagas and the native literary tradition in general have continued to play an important part in Laxness's writings. A number of his later novels bear witness to this influence. But here one feels the presence not so much of the sagas themselves as of the heritage of innumerable Icelandic folk-poets

and authors, who have, of course, passed on the narrative art of the sagas in many ways. Two of these novels are labelled as "annals" or "chronicles" in their titles: *Brekkukotsannáll* [Annals of Brekkukot, 1957] and *Innansveitarkronika* [A Parish Chronicle, 1970]. The terms are appropriate. These works are in fact more like chronicles than dramatic fictional representations of social life, as Laxness's earlier novels had been.

This change is clearly related to a modification of his earlier radical satire which has recently become apparent. Things are now viewed from a distance in Laxness's work, in a completely undogmatic, almost wholly detached way. Laxness seems to have withdrawn to a kind of grassroots position, leaving all doctrines and systems aside. Thus in an essay dating from 1963 he says: "In my youth, the gibberish of Freud competed with that of the Marxists to plague the language spoken in the West. Today it is best to be on one's guard against this blight on spoken and written language, so as not to become branded as old-fashioned."[39] Disillusioned by his past experiences, Laxness has now adopted a sceptical attitude of non-involvement as his guiding star.

In a chapter of the novel *Brekkukotsannáll* entitled "The University of the Icelanders" the author reminds us of the stories told among ordinary Icelandic people. Among such people there was little enthusiasm for "Danish novels - which was our name for modern literature in general, especially if it had a touch of hysteria."[40] In the cottage of Brekkukot stories are told in a different manner:

> The stories were legion. But most of them had one thing in common: the method of telling them was directly opposed to the one we associated with Danish novels - the storyteller's own life had nothing to do with the story; his opinions had still less to do with it. The plot of the story was allowed to speak for itself. . . . Cool and lofty, the story lived its own life independently of its telling, free from the smell of men - rather like Nature, in which the elements have complete dominion.[41]

There is no doubt that the author sympathizes with this kind of narrative art. Many of his statements from later years confirm that he regards this ideal not only as an artistic but also as a moral value. The inheritance of an uninterrupted tradition signifies, for him, discipline and objectivity combined with equanimity and balance in the interaction of man, matter and language - qualities which he regards, or would like to regard, as distinctive features of a true Icelandic disposition.

(viii)

Throughout his life as an author Laxness has felt the saga tradition as a fruitful and perhaps sometimes terrifying challenge. But in later years his attitude to it has developed a new character. It is no longer marked by dialectical tension or confrontation.

Instead, he has come to study the ancient literature more and more as a scholar, so to speak, in an almost academic manner. This interest of his has often become apparent in his later collections of essays.

This is not to say that Laxness is now writing or arguing as a professional scholar, in strictly poised and guarded terms. That has never been his style, and still is not. At the beginning of this paper I quoted his words on the poet of *Völuspá*, who "stood beneath this vast sky of Iceland, and could not spell his name." A few years later this same poet, as viewed by Laxness, became a learned man well versed in Latin - because he had to be another kind of man in the argument that Laxness was then offering.[42] But that is perhaps an extreme case. His reflections on such matters should not always be taken literally, or too seriously. They are often refreshing, however, and may sometimes force scholars out of their accustomed thought-patterns, making them reconsider certain facts and points of view.

Laxness has never regarded Old Icelandic literature as something belonging to the past. He knows that "an Icelandic author cannot live without constantly having the ancient books in his thoughts." Like no other modern author, he has adopted the heritage of the "old fogeys" as a profoundly enlivening element in his own creative work. The dialogue between old and new, between Iceland and the larger world, has imbued his writings with a characteristic tension. In this interplay of contrasts, the saga tradition has served as an important catalyst. Out of his confrontation with this glorious literary heritage Halldór Laxness, the man of our times, has formed his vision of Iceland and its people.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In my rendering of quotations from Laxness in English I have profited very much from my friend Rory McTurk's excellent translation of my book, *Halldór Laxness* (New York, 1971). A bibliography of English (and other) translations of Laxness's writings will be found in P.M. Mitchell and Kenneth H. Ober, *Bibliography of Modern Icelandic Literature in Translation, including Works Written by Icelanders in Other Languages*, Islandica 40 (Ithaca and London, 1975) pp.164-186.

NOTES

1 *Íslendíngaspjall* (Reykjavík, 1967) pp.78-9: "Þeim veslum mönnum sem nú eru að burðast við að skrifa bækur, einsog ég og mínir líkar, er oft illa viðvært í landinu: hver ótíndur strákur getur sannað svo ekki verður í móti mælt að við séum lakari prósahöfundar en þeir sem bjuggu til Njálu eða Hrafnkötlu eða Heimskrínglu; sömuleiðis hafi okkur hrakað töluvert sem ljóðskáldum síðan á tíundu öld að höfundur Völuspár stóð undir þessum víðum himni Íslands og kunni ekki að stafa nafnið sitt."

2 "Minnisgreinar um fornsögur" [Notes on the Sagas], *Tímarit Máls og menningar* 6 (1945) pp.13-56; my quotation is from the reprint in Halldór Laxness, *Sjálfsagðir hlutir* [Obvious Things] (Reykjavík, 1946) p.9: "Höfuðafsökun mín fyrir þessum greinum er þó sú, að íslenskur rithöfundur getur ekki lifað án þess að vera síhugsandi um hinar gömlu bækur."

3 *Heiman eg fór* [From Home I Went] (Reykjavík, 1952) pp.23-24; the manuscript dating from 1924: "En það var amma mín sem fóstraði mig úngan, og ég er hreykinn af að hafa setið við fótskör þeirrar konu sem fjærst var því að vera tísku háð eða aldarfari, allra kvenna, þeirra er ég hef þekt. Súngið hefur hún eldforn ljóð við mig ómálgan, sagt mér æfintýr úr heiðni og kveðið mér vögguljóð úr kaþólsku. . . .

Túngutak hennar var hreint og sterkt og einginn hljómur falskur í málfarinu. Ég hef ekkert þekt rammíslenskara en mál þessarar fornaldarkonu . . . . Það var mál átta hundruð ára gamallar menníngar úr íslenskum uppsveitum, ósnortið og undursamlegt, gagnsýrt hinum óskilgreinilega keimi upprunans líkt og viltur ávöxtur."

4 Letter to Einar Ólafur Sveinsson, dated April 17, 1923, S. Maurice de Clervaux: "út af Snorra, og þá ifirleitt út af þessum gömlu íslensku bókum":

"Og það eina sem ég segi, er: Heu mihi, ég get ekkert lært af þeim. Þessir gömlu karlar leggja mesta áhersluna einmitt á það sem nútíðarhöfundar leggja minsta á - nfl. að búa til kontúrur. Þeir eru allir í því að tína saman einhver hundleiðinleg facta, sem einga skepnu geta interesserað. . . .

Málið hjá þessum Snorra er sennilega ekki óviturlegt, það sem það nær, og góð íslenska. . . . En sem sagt, það liggur á alt öðrum sviðum en okkar mál, og maðurinn hugsar með alt öðruvísi innréttuðum heila en nútíðarmenn, og interesserar sig fyrir alt öðrum atburðum og hlutum en við (t.d. er hann mjög interesseraður firir því ef einhver kongúngur gefur manni frakka eða hríng).

Ég held ifirleitt að ekki sé hægt að læra að skrifa nýja íslensku af gamalli íslensku. Það þarf eitthvað annað."

5 *Vefarinn mikli frá Kasmír* (Reykjavík, 1927) p.456: "Ég er lifandi líkamníng þeirrar manntegundar, sem séð hefur dagsins ljós síðustu tíu, tólf árin, en aldrei var áður til. Og til að kveða enn nánar á: Ég er íslenskur Vestur-Evrópumaður, mettaður anda þeirrar tíðar, sem sett hefur

mannkynssöguna í gálgann, hugsun mín frjáls eins og hjá manni, sem hefði rignt niður úr stjörnunum í ágúst árið 1914 . . . Skáld, sem vaxið er upp úr samhángandi erfðamenníngu, sem á rætur sínar allar götur aftur í forngrísku, á ekki meira sammerkt við mig en t.d. Neanderdalsmaðurinn eða burknauppgrafníngar frá fornöld jarðsögunnar. . . . Mér gæti aldrei komið til hugar að vitna í rit, sem samið hafi verið fyrir 1914 . . ."

6 *Alþýðubókin* (Reykjavík, 1929)' pp.69-70: "Þjóð hins elzta menningarmáls í Evrópu og hinnar elztu samstæðu sögu vaknar nú sem hin yngsta menningarþjóð álfunnar. . . . Þjóðin svaf milli fjalla, sem voru krökk af vættum og álfum, og í þessu ósnortna landslagi, þar sem hver dalur er þó endurminning úr sögu vorri, hver öræfasýn ímynd vorra dulrænustu skynjana, - þar rísum vér á fætur í dag eins og nýfæddir menn, gæddir frumleik náttúrubarnsins, með mál guðanna á vörunum og himin morgunsins yfir oss logandi í spám og teiknum."

7 *Alþýðubókin*, p.37: "en hetjur nefnum vér stórmenni íslenzks stíls, og ekki spámenn."

8 *Alþýðubókin*, p.47: "Guð vill, að ég sé Íslendingur."

9 The novel was published in two volumes: *Þú vínviður hreini* [Oh Thou Pure Vine] (Reykjavík, 1931) and *Fuglinn í fjörunni* [The Bird on the Beach] (Reykjavík, 1932).

10 *Fuglinn*, p.153: "hér var föðurlandið í veði, sjálfræði þjóðarinnar og framtak einstaklingsins, sem verið hefur helgust erfð vors göfuga kyns allar götur framan úr fornöld, að blankir höfðingjar sigldu skipum sínum til Englands, slátruðu ungbörnum, nauðguðu konum og stálu kúm."

11 *Fuglinn*, pp.175-6: "dugandi háseti, mjög vel lesinn í Íslendingasögunum og gagntekinn af hetjuanda."

12 *Fuglinn*, p.176: "lifa og deyja upp á eigin býti eins og urðarkettir."

13 *Fuglinn*, p.176: "En auðmýkingu, sem færi í bága við hetjudáðir fornmanna og andann í Íslendingasögunum, slíkt gátu menn ekki þolað."

14 In an interview in the newspaper *Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfartstidning*, October 25, 1955, Laxness said that the new novel, i.e. *Brekkukotsannáll*, on which he was then working, took place "i epikens tid. Utan inblandning av tid" ["in epic time. Without interference by time"].

15 The four volumes of the tetralogy have the titles: *Ljós heimsins* [The Light of the World] (Reykjavík, 1937), *Höll sumarlandsins* [The Palace of the Summerland] (Reykjavík, 1938), *Hús skáldsins* [The House of the Poet] (Reykjavík, 1939) and *Fegurð himinsins* [The Beauty of the Skies] (Reykjavík, 1940).

16 *Hús skáldsins*, pp.75-6: "Aldrei kom fyrir að hann hallaði á mann í frásögn, aldrei feldi hann siðferðilegan dóm um verknað né verksfremjanda fremur en þegar Snorri Sturluson segir af störfum konúnga eða ása. Þessi maður sem sjálfur gat ekki gert kvikindi mein, aldrei bar það við í þáttum hans að vart yrði hneykslunar á svokölluðum vondum verkum; hann sagði frá aðeins vegna þess að honum þótti sögulegt. . . . Sá sem skrifaði bækurnar var allur annar en hinn auðmjúki játandi almennrar meðalhegðunar sem maður sá á daginn óðfúsan að þóknast hverjum sem hann hitti."

[17] On "Minnisgreinar", see note 2 above.

[18] *Sjálfsagðir hlutir*, p.66: "Fornsagan var okkar óvinnanlega borg, og það er hennar verk að við erum sjálfstæð þjóð í dag."

[19] The three volumes of the trilogy are: *Íslandsklukkan* [The Bell of Iceland] (Reykjavík, 1943), *Hið ljósa man* [The Bright Maid] (Reykjavík, 1944) and *Eldur í Kaupinhafn* [Fire in Copenhagen] (Reykjavík, 1946). In the Icelandic quotations below the volumes are referred to only as I, II and III.

[20] I, p.194: "Forfaðir minn Gunnar á Hlíðarenda var tólf álnir á hæð. . . . . Tólf álnir, endurtók Jón Hreggviðsson. Ég sný ekki aftur með það. Og varð þrjú hundruð ára. Og bar gullhlað um enni. Atgeirinn hafði þann fegursta saung sem heyrst hefur á Norðurlöndum."

[21] III, pp.125-6: "Vor skáld ortu ljóð og sögðu sögu á máli sjálfs Óðins kóngs úr Ásgarði meðan Evrópa mælti á túngu þræla. Hvar eru þau ljóð, hvar þær sögur sem þér danskir ortuð? Jafnvel yðar fornhetjum höfum vér íslenskir gefið líf í vorum bókum. . . . Forlátið ég set á tölur, forlátið vér erum sagnþjóð og getum aungvu gleymt."

[22] III, pp.126-7: "Vér íslenskir erum sannarlega ekki ofgóðir að deya. Og lífið er oss laungu einskisvert. Aðeins eitt getum vér ekki mist meðan einn maður, hvortheldur ríkur eða fátækur, stendur uppi af þessu fólki; og jafnvel dauðir getum vér ekki verið þess án; og þetta er það sem um er talað í því gamla kvæði, það sem vér köllum orðstír."

[23] III, p.24: "Þar rísa hreggbarin fjöll úr úfnum sjó og jökultindar slúngnir stormskýum."

[24] III, p.25: "Það er ekki til ægilegri sýn en Ísland sem það rís úr hafi, sagði Arnas Arnæus.
Ekki veit ég það, sagði Þýskarinn dálítið undrandi.
Við þá sýn eina skilst sú dul að hér voru skrifaðar mestar bækur í samanlagðri kristninni, sagði Arnas Arnæus.
Þó svo væri, sagði Þýskarinn.
Ég veit þér skiljið nú, sagði Arnas Arnæus: að það er ekki hægt að kaupa Ísland."

[25] III, p.140: "Syndir, sagði Jón Hreggviðsson og rauk uppá nef sér. Ég hef aldrei drýgt neina synd. Ég er ærlegur stórglæpamaður."

[26] II, p.40: "Mín hamíngja er ekki uppskrifuð eftir bænabók."

[27] III, p.107: "Sleppum öllum hégóma."

[28] II, p.85: "Ég hef altaf vitað að túnga skáldakynsins forfeðra yðar og formæðra er af heiðinni rót."

[29] II, p.148: "Það er til fjall í Kinninni fyrir norðan, sem heitir Bakrángi ef maður sér austaná það, Ógaunguffjall ef maður stendur fyrir vestan það, en utanaf Skjálfanda kalla sjófarendur það Galta."

[30] II, p.213: "Ekkert hefur gerst nema hægt sé að sanna það."

[31] Interestingly enough, in a letter to me dated March 13, 1959, Hemingway remarks that he has "not read the sagas recently but almost certainly

read some at some time."

32 From the newspaper *Þjóðviljinn* [The Will of the People], December 23, 1944: "Fyrir hundrað árum var viðkvæmnin tízka hjá rómantíkurunum. Nú er tízka að vera með einhverja kaldhæðni í stað viðkvæmninnar, en það er í rauninni aðeins ranghverfa, neitun viðkvæmninnar. Ég hef verið að reyna að æfa mig í að forðast þetta hvorttveggja, komast í annað plan en þessi hugsunarháttur liggur í, reyna að sjá hlutina utan frá í stað innan frá."

33 I, pp.23-4: "Jóni Hreggviðssyni brá ekki við fyrstu höggin, en við fjórða og fimta högg hljóp í skrokkinn stjarfi svo geingu upp á honum endarnir og vatnaði undir fótleggi, andlit og ofanvert brjóst, en þungi mannsins hvíldi á spentum kviðnum, hnefarnir kreptust, fæturnir réttust fram í öklanum, liðir stirðnuðu og vöðvar hörðnuðu; það sá í iljar manninum að hann var í nýstögluðum skóm."

34 See my article "Halldór Laxness' Gerpla. Einige Bemerkungen über Sprache und Tendenz", in *Scientia Islandica. Science in Iceland.* Anniversary volume (1968), pp.31-40. On Archbishop Fisher, see p.39.

35 "Vér Íslendíngar erum friðsamir bændur og fiskimenn, og þær hetjur sem vér dýrkum í fornum kvæðum eiga ekkert skylt við hetjurnar í herjum nútímans, sem stórvirkastir eru í því að granda vopnlausu fólki með kjarnorkuspreingjum, napalmbombum og öðrum múgmorðstækjum, en duga að öðru leyti illa til hernaðar." (From a speech made at Þingvellir on June 25, 1952; under the heading "Vér Íslendíngar - og trúin á stálið" [We Icelanders - and faith in steel] in *Dagur í senn* [A Day at a Time] (Reykjavík, 1955).

36 *Gerpla* (Reykjavík, 1952) p.29: "er oss járn skapfeldra."

37 *Gerpla*, p.474: "Aungum hefur þó Ólafur konúngur jafnkær orðið sem íslenskum skáldum, og er þar til marks að aldrigi hefur í heimi verið bók ritin um konúnga, né um sjálfan Krist in heldur, er kæmist í hálfkvisti við þá er Snorri hinn fróði hefur saman setta, og heitir Ólafs saga hins helga."

38 *Gerpla*, p.490: "En dauða Þormóðar kolbrúnarskálds að Stiklarstöðum hafa sagnamenn íslenskir reifðan lofi á ódauðlegum bókum, svo að orðstír skáldsins mætti uppi verða eigi skemur en þess konúngs er hann leitaði og fann."

39 "Golfranska Freuds keptist við golfrönsku marxista um að tröllsliga mælt mál Vesturlanda á mínum sokkabandsárum. Í dag er vissara að vera á verði fyrir þessari óværu í tali og skrifum til að verða ekki brennimerktur sem eftirlegukind." (From a chapter in *Skáldatími* [A Writer's Schooling] (Reykjavík, 1963) p.55.)

40 *Brekkukotsannáll* (Reykjavík, 1957), p.71: "danska rómani - en sú nafngift var hjá okkur höfð um nútímabokmentir yfirleitt, en þó sérstaklega um móðursýki."

41 *Brekkukotasannáll*, pp.71-2: "Sögurnar eru margar, en þær áttu flestar sammerkt í einu, þær voru sagðar öfugt við þá aðferð sem við kendum við danska rómani; líf sögumanns sjálfs kom aldrei málinu við, þaðanafsíður skoðanir hans. Söguefnið eitt var látið tala. . . . Sagan sjálf lifði svöl og upphafin sérstöku lífi í blóra við frásögnina, laus við mannaþef, dálítið einsog náttúran, þar sem höfuðskepnurnar ráða einar öllu."

[42] For Laxness on the author of *Völuspá*, see the chapter "Latína og enska í Völuspá" [Latin and English in Völuspá] in *Yfirskygðir staðir* [Hidden Places] (Reykjavík, 1971) pp.32-9.

AELFRIC'S LONGER *LIFE OF ST MARTIN* AND ITS LATIN SOURCES: A STUDY IN NARRATIVE TECHNIQUE

By JUDITH GAITES

Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* are in some respects a rather neglected area in the body of Old English prose. Such work as has been carried out has tended to concentrate mainly on linguistic and stylistic analysis with particular attention to the question of "rhythmic prose".[1] Appreciation of the literary qualities of Ælfric's work can be extended by an examination of his handling of his subject matter in relation to his sources, such as has been carried out by Cecily Clark in her comparison between Ælfric's *Life of St Edmund* and Abbo of Fleury's Latin life, which is his source.[2] This paper will attempt a similar kind of study of Ælfric's second *Life of St Martin*[3] in relation to its main sources. G.H. Gerould has written on Ælfric's treatment of his source material in his two Lives of St Martin, but his brief observations are mainly restricted to Ælfric's selection and arrangement of material.[4] The earlier version of the *Life of St Martin* is included in the *Catholic Homilies*[5] but this is a very compressed, although comprehensive account, and the fuller version in the *Lives of Saints* affords a better opportunity of observing Ælfric's skill in selecting and manipulating his material.

Ælfric's second *Life of St Martin* was written in 996 or 997[6] and is based on Sulpicius Severus' *Vita Sancti Martini* and its supplementary epistles;[7] however, he incorporates additional material from Sulpicius' *Dialogi*[8] and Gregory of Tours' *De Virtutibus Sancti Martini*.[9] The *Dialogi* were used simply to augment the number of miracles, and Gregory's *De Virtutibus* furnished additional material for the account of miracles associated with Martin's death, an important feature of hagiographical narrative. In his opening remarks, Ælfric acknowledges that his main debt is to Sulpicius:

> Sulpicius hatte sum snoter writere .
> Ðe wolde awritan þa wundra and mihta
> þe martinus se mæra mihtiglice gefremode
> on þisre worulde . and he wrat þa be him
> . . . .
> and we þæt englisc nimað of þære ylcan gesetnysse .
> (Skeat, 218/1-4; 220/8)

Yet the overall structure of Ælfric's *Life* differs considerably from that of the *Vita*. This is partly because he draws on additional sources which enable him to give a complete account of

Martin's life and death, whereas Sulpicius' main work on Martin, written between 391 and 397, the year of Martin's death, was really a collection of anecdotes that had grown up around the saint during his lifetime. The *Vita* could not relate the circumstances of his death, which were to form a central episode in Ælfric's *Life*.

This difference in structure is also a reflection of the differing purpose of the biographers. The focus of Sulpicius' attention is Martin himself, and his intention seems to be to gain recognition for him and his way of life amongst his contemporaries. By the time Ælfric was writing, however, some six hundred years later, Martin was a well-established saint. Ælfric's intention, therefore, was to tell the story in a way that would meet his didactic aims as a preacher, and this is reflected in his adaptation of his material to suit the needs of his audience. He carries out these adaptations in a variety of ways, not only through supplementation of the *Vita* with information from other sources, but also through abridgement, omission and reordering of his source material. It is with an examination of these techniques that I begin.

1. Abridgements

In his Latin preface to the *Lives of Saints* Ælfric makes known his intention of abridging the longer texts:

> Hoc sciendum etiam quod prolixiores passiones breviamus verbis, non adeo sensu, ne fastidiosis ingeratur tedium si tanta prolixitas erit in propria lingua quanta est in latina.[10]

However, in presenting his account of the life and miracles of Martin, Ælfric adds to the narrative by his inclusion of material from other sources and omits little, apart from the dedicatory epistle and introduction to the *Vita* and some personal anecdotes towards the end of it. It is more characteristic of Ælfric to condense material which is of no particular interest to him, as he does in Section VII, where he abridges an episode in Sulpicius' *Vita*:

> Nam cum fortuito lector, cui legendi eo die officium erat, interclusus a populo defuisset, turbatis ministris, dum expectatur qui non aderat, unus e circumstantibus, sumpto psalterio, quem primum versum invenit, arripuit. (*Vita*, 9/5)

This detailed account is condensed by Ælfric into two simple sentences:

> ac se rædere wæs utan belocen . þa ge-læhte sum preost
> ænne sealtere sona . and þæt ærest gemette
> rædde him æt-foran . . . (Skeat, 236/274-276)

Often it is rhetorical material that is omitted, as, for example, Sulpicius' introductory section which follows his dedicatory epistle. He uses this to explain both his motivation in writing

an account of Martin and his stylistic intentions. Since the collection of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* as a whole has a Latin and an English preface, there is no need for further explanation of this kind, and Ælfric proceeds directly with the narrative. Another type of material which Ælfric omits is political comment that has only historical relevance and thus has no part in Ælfric's plan. Sulpicius includes such a passage immediately prior to his account of Martin's relationship with the Emperor Maximus (*Vita*, 20/1). There, Sulpicius criticises the corruption among the churchmen of his age and uses the example of Martin as a contrast to this. Ælfric, instead, reproduces only the action of the story (Skeat, 258/610-649). The historical content of the passage was certainly irrelevant to Ælfric's purpose, but he might well have retained the general moral point.

In another instance Ælfric both achieves conciseness and increases dramatic tension by an omission of this nature. This occurs during the account of Martin's death (Skeat, 302/1325-1370), when Martin replies to the monks' tearful entreaties to remain with them. He makes a moving speech expressing his willingness to submit to the will of God. In his version in the *Epistula Tertia* Sulpicius interrupts this speech to insert a passage that explains Martin's psychological condition and that draws a moral from his behaviour. Ælfric, however, allows the speech to continue, relying on its impact to convey Martin's motives and character. This helps to make the scene one of the most dramatic in the *Life of St Martin*, since it consists of a number of exchanges between Martin and his disciples, with more direct speech concentrated in it than in any other section of the *Life*.

Ælfric's handling of reported and direct speech generally is very skilful, and frequently contributes a dramatic quality to his writing. Similar observations have been made by Cecily Clark[11] in her discussion of the way in which Ælfric condenses long passages of speech into a few terse lines in the *Life of St Edmund*. The same techniques are apparent also in the *Life of St Martin*, where the rendering of long passages of direct speech (often highly rhetorical in character) into reported speech considerably shortens them, and the issues involved are sharpened by a judicious and sparing use of direct speech. This is the case in Section XIV, where the lengthy appeal of a paralysed girl's father to Martin is summarised, with only one line directly quoted:

> ic ge-lyfe he cwæð . þæt heo libbe þurh þe .
> (Skeat, 250/494)

This simple expression of confidence in Martin strikes us today as more moving and more persuasive than the emotional rhetoric employed by Sulpicius in accordance with the conventions of his age.

On occasion, however, Ælfric is motivated solely by the desire for brevity, and may even reduce the dramatic content of the writing by the use of reported speech, as in Section XVI, where Martin's exorcism of a demon is described. In the *Vita*, Martin

addresses the demon in a single line of direct speech:

> si habes, inquit, aliquid potestas, hos devora.
> (*Vita*, 17/6)

But this is reported as part of the narrative in Ælfric's *Life* (Skeat, 254/540). In fact it shortens the episode only slightly, and reduces the sense of conflict; nevertheless, the rejection of the device of direct speech in the minor incidents means that it has all the more impact when Ælfric employs it during the relation of more significant scenes, such as the death of the saint.

In order to keep his narrative short and direct and to prevent it from becoming static, Ælfric frequently leaves out extended descriptions and so gives a general account without the support of elaborating details. He does so in Section II, when Martin does not quit the military service after his baptism, but stays on "for his leafan ealdormenn" (Skeat, 224/91). This conveys Martin's reason quite adequately and in terms which would have been readily comprehensible to an Anglo-Saxon audience. It is, however, briefer than the explanation in the *Vita*, which goes on to describe Martin's relationship with his captain:

> Nec tamen statim militiae renuntiavit, tribuni sui precibus evictus, cui contubernium familiare praestabat.
> (*Vita*, 3/5)

In this instance, Ælfric's omission of detail is perfectly acceptable, since the general statement gives sufficient information. However, this is not the case in his account of Martin halting a pagan funeral procession (Skeat, 242/366-87). Ælfric tells us that the men were carrying a corpse that Martin mistook for an idol, but does not, as Sulpicius does, explain that the corpse's white wrappings fluttering in the breeze looked like the garments used to deck idols. Thus, not only does Ælfric leave us without the vivid visual image of the funeral procession, but he provides no explanation for Martin's mistake. Both the above examples, the second in particular, suggest that Ælfric's main interest is in the events themselves, rather than with how they are brought about.

Another device which Ælfric uses to condense descriptive passages is to select one representative item from a catalogue of details in the *Vita*. He does this in Section I, when he gives an account of Martin's treatment of his servant:

> þam he sylf þenode . swiþor þonne he him .
> and samod hi gereordoden swa swa gelican .
> (Skeat, 222/38-9)

The general statement is made and supported with one specific example, but in the corresponding passage in Sulpicius there are further details, including the facts that Martin removes and cleans his servant's boots, as well as most often serving him at table (*Vita*, 2/5). The effect of the omission is to change the emphasis

of the passage; in Sulpicius, Martin adopts a subservient role, but he is shown to treat the servant as an equal in Ælfric's version.

In the passage where the bishops are debating Martin's suitability to become Bishop of Tours, Ælfric registers the opposition to him by quoting the objection:

> þæt martinus nære wyrðe swa miceles hades .
> for his wacum gyrlum . (Skeat, 236/269-70)

This single detail epitomises the catalogue of criticisms in the *Vita*:

> dicentes scilicet contemptibilem esse personam,
> indignu esse episcopatu hominem vultu despicabilem,
> veste sordidum crine deformem. (*Vita*, 9/3)

Moreover it is not chosen without due consideration, for, as the most trivial of the objections, it emphasises the poor judgement and misplaced priorities of those bishops who opposed Martin.

Connected with this method of abridgement is the technique adopted by Ælfric in relating the resurrection of the dead man in Section VI (Skeat, 234/244-53). In the previous section a similar miracle had been recounted, including a description of the process of the dead man's revival, following closely that in Sulpicius (*Vita*, 7/3):

> þa æfter twæm tidum astyrode se deada
> eallum limum . and lociende wæs .
> (Skeat, 234/220-221)

Having already given such an account once, Ælfric does not follow Sulpicius in repeating a description of the process on the second occasion, but states briefly,

> he sona ge-edcucode . (Skeat, 234/250)

There is little loss here in the reduction of the second description to a bare statement, since only a repetition is involved. However, in another episode where he reduces the description to statement, there is a loss of enjoyment for the reader. This occurs in Section X, during the account of the felling of a pine-tree sacred to the heathens. Sulpicius takes great delight in evoking an atmosphere of tension and drama in his narration of the incident, drawing out the description of events to make the scene more vivid:

> cum iam fragorem sui pinus concidens edidisset, iam
> cadenti, iam super se ruenti, elevata obviam manu,
> signum salutis opponit. Tum vero - velut turbinis modo
> retro actam putares - diversam in partam ruit.
> (*Vita*, 13/8)

Ælfric, as usual, spurns embellishment here and proceeds in his terse style:

> and se beam þa feallende beah to martine .
> Martinus þa unforht ongean þæt feallende treow
> worhte rode-tacn . and hit wende þa ongean .
> (Skeat, 246/413-415)

Although Sulpicius' account is the more lively because of his overt use of his rhetorical skills, this would be uncharacteristic of Ælfric, writing in a different mode and at a different time. He is equally skilled in the arts of rhetoric, but practises them only to express his meaning in the most effective way, never for sheer delight in obvious rhetorical adornment. His method of relating this episode, then, is in keeping with the rest of the work and again reflects his interest in the progress of the action rather than its causes and attendant circumstances.

2. Reordering

The structure of Ælfric's work is affected also by his reorganisation of material, and this is often very skilfully carried out. Generally speaking, he keeps separate material from the different sources, so that the first twenty-seven sections are drawn almost exclusively from the *Vita*; the following section is based on an incident from *Epistula Secunda*, and sections XXIX-L are drawn from material in the *Dialogi*. *Epistula Tertia* is the source for sections LI-LII and the remaining material is from Gregory of Tours' *De Virtutibus Sancti Martini*. Thus, the work can be divided broadly into two parts, the first based on Sulpicius' *Vita Sancti Martini* and the second on the three additional sources, somewhat intermingled, but still in their own individual blocks. Within this framework, however, Ælfric carried out a good deal of rearranging.

One of his principles in reordering material was to gather together incidents of a similar nature, so that, for example, sections X-XIII relate some of Martin's experiences in destroying heathen temples, while in sections XIV-XX a number of accounts are given of Martin performing miraculous cures. Although this is to some extent a feature of the whole structure of the *Vita*, the relationship between episodes is often better achieved by Ælfric, as can be seen by his treatment of the theme of appearances of the Devil to Martin.

Ælfric begins his account of diabolic visions in Section XXIV, drawing his introduction from the *Vita*:

> Diabolum vero ita conspicabilem et subiectum oculis habebat ut, sive se in propria substantia contineret, sive in diversas figuras nequitiae transtulisset, qualibet ab eo sub imagine videretur. 2. Quod cum diabolus sciret se effugere non posse, conviciis eum frequenter urguebat, quia fallere non posset insidiis.
> (*Vita*, 21/1-2)

Ælfric renders this as:

Eac swilce þa deofla mid heora searo-cræftum
him comon gelome to . and he on-cneow hi æfre .
. . . .
Mid þusend searo-cræftum wolde se swicola deofol
þone halgan wer on sume wisan beswican .
and hine ge-sewen-licne on manegum scin-hiwum
þam halgan æteowde . . . .
(Skeat, 264/ 706-7; 710-13)

In the *Vita* the episode which follows has little to do with this introduction; it cannot properly be called a diabolic vision of the kind suggested. The clause "sive se in propria substantia contineret" indicates that the Devil appears to Martin undisguised, but the emphasis of the passage certainly leads us to expect the following episode to deal with a vision of the Devil in a false form. The Devil indeed appears to Martin, but not in disguise, and the incident is primarily concerned with the killing of one of Martin's men. Ælfric, on the other hand, selects as his introductory material an unequivocal account of devils (he uses the plural form) appearing to Martin under various forms and then turns to a later passage in the *Vita*, where Sulpicius relates how the Devil appears to Martin in the guise of various pagan gods (*Vita*, 22/1). This provides an excellent illustration of the general comments made in Ælfric's introduction to the section. Ælfric continues to follow Chap. 22 of the *Vita*, where the Devil, having failed to deceive Martin's sight, turns to verbal attack. Ælfric then turns to Chap. 24 for a further appearance of the Devil disguised, this time as Christ. Only now does Ælfric return to Chap. 21 to relate the Devil's appearance to Martin in which he is openly himself, claiming to have killed one of Martin's men. It is a curious fact that, following this event Ælfric retains Sulpicius' comment on Martin's foresight (Skeat, 268/788-9), since this particular incident demonstrates, if anything, the opposite.

These examples illustrate how Ælfric selects and arranges material from his major source, but he also applies this principle to material gathered from his supplementary sources, although he achieves this in a slightly different way. It has already been noted that his general tendency is to keep most of the material from a particular source together, so that, for example, there are further instances of miraculous cures in the later sections of the *Life* which are drawn from the *Dialogi*, although the topic has already received attention in sections XIV-XX. There are, nevertheless, occasions where material from one of the supplementary sources is incorporated into a passage based on the *Vita*. One such example occurs in Section XXII. The preceding section, following Chap. 20 of the *Vita*, had recounted Martin's relationship with Maximus and the fulfilment of his prophecy of Maximus' death at the hands of Valentinian. Both the fact that the episode was concerned with Martin's conduct towards a ruler and the mention of Valentinian make it appropriate that Ælfric should include the story of Martin's experiences with Valentinian as a ruler at this point; the source for this is *Dialogus* II, Chap. 5. Thus Ælfric gathers together episodes of similar significance or circumstances to form a

coherent passage. By this means he also achieves a sense of continuity and plan in his presentation of material which is, of itself, somewhat disjointed.

In the *Vita*, the disjointed nature of the material is often glaringly obvious, as when Sulpicius resorts to such abrupt and stilted introductory phrases as:

> Atque ut in minora tantis inseram . . .
> (*Vita*, 20/1)

In such cases, Ælfric proceeds immediately with the narrative proper, as he does here (Skeat, 258/609). He does not attempt to justify the change of subject by a phrase that merely draws attention to the transition. Of course, linkage between episodes is sometimes competently managed by Sulpicius, as in *Vita*, 17/5, where the fact that two incidents take place in the same town allows him to introduce the second with the words: "per idem tempus, in eodem oppido". In this case, Ælfric accepts the transitional phrase, translating it: "On þære ylcan tide on þam ylcan fæstene" (Skeat, 252/527).

As well as attempting to gather together material of a similar nature, Ælfric also introduces into a single episode information from a variety of sources, where this is appropriate. For example, in Section VIII, Martin's appointment as Bishop of Tours is related, and Ælfric follows the *Vita*, Chap. 10 for this. Giving a brief account of Martin's qualities as a bishop, Sulpicius writes:

> Idem enim constantissime perseverabat qui prius fuerat. 2. Eadem in corde eius humilitas, eadem in vestitu eius vilitas erat. (*Vita*, 10/1-2)

Ælfric translates this (Skeat, 238/288-9) and continues the theme by drawing on Sulpicius' concluding remarks on Martin's virtues in general (*Vita*, 26/2). This fulfils a dual purpose: it is an appropriate place to include a eulogy, since it is an occasion where Martin receives public recognition of his qualities, and it is a climax in the story. Ælfric's expansion of the passage is an acknowledgement of both these facts. Similarly, in relating Martin's healing of Paulinus' eyes (Skeat, 256/585-600), Ælfric incorporates a brief description of Paulinus drawn from a separate passage in the *Vita* (25/4). This adds to the interest of the miracle, for it emphasises Martin's holiness and adds to his authority when such a holy man as Paulinus is cured only by Martin's intervention.

As well as repositioning material so as to alter the structure of his work on a large scale, Ælfric employs similar methods in his treatment of individual episodes, and on a number of occasions he alters the way in which an anecdote progresses. This rearrangement of material within a narrative episode usually involves either an alteration in the order of events related, improving the clarity of the narrative, or a change in the order of presentation of circumstantial details (e.g. of description), thus shifting slightly the

emphasis or significance of the episode.

A good example of the first kind of rearrangement occurs in Ælfric's Section XX, in the introduction to the episode where Martin falls down a flight of steps. The Latin text reads:

> Ipse autem, cum casu quodam esset de cenaculo devolutus et, per confragosos scalae gradus decidens, multis vulneribus esset adfectus, cum exanimis iaceret in cellula et inmodicus doloribus cruciaretur, nocte ei angelus visus est. (*Vita*, 19/4)

The main clause of this sentence is not reached until "nocte ei angelus visus est", so that the whole of the preceding passage is, in fact, looking back into the past, and the action only starts to move forward from the point where the main clause is reached. Ælfric, on the other hand, treats the introductory material as part of the main structure of the narrative and presents it in chronological order:

> On sumere tide martinus stah to anre up-flora .
> þa wæron þære hlæddre stapas alefede on ær .
> and toburston færinga þæt he feol adune .
> and mid manegum wundum ge-wæht wearð swiðe .
> swa þæt he seoc læg on his synderlican inne .
> On þære nihte him com an engel to him
> sylfum onlocigendum . . . (Skeat, 258/601-07)

This organisation of the material, which respects English rather than Latin syntactical structures, simplifies, clarifies and enlivens the tale and allows Ælfric to devote a new sentence to the appearance of the angel, the central point of the story.

On another occasion Ælfric repositions a whole section of an episode, although for a different purpose from that of the example cited above. When he relates Martin's escape from a fire (Skeat, 272/900-274/888), based on Sulpicius' *Epistula Prima*, Ælfric moves directly into the action of the episode, omitting all Sulpicius' introductory material, and giving no indication that he is turning to a new source. He has two reasons for this. The first is his desire to maintain the continuity of the work; the second is that Sulpicius is relating the story under a particular set of circumstances which he is at pains to describe, namely that he is refuting certain criticisms that have been levelled against Martin's behaviour on that occasion. Ælfric is not writing under any constraint of this kind, so the material would be inappropriate as an introduction to his own account. However, once the tale has been related, Ælfric remembers the adverse reaction of Martin's contemporaries and, extracting a general moral from Sulpicius' specific address, uses part of this introduction as his own conclusion, warning his audience against misinterpreting the story. Thus, where Sulpicius puts forward an argument and illustrates it with an anecdote, Ælfric relates a story and draws a moral from it, changing the construction of the episode for his own purpose.

Related to this are instances where Ælfric rearranges material in order to change subtly the interpretation or emphasis. This is particularly well illustrated by Section IV, where Martin is captured by a band of robbers. During his captivity he is questioned by one of them, and in Sulpicius' account (*Vita*, 5/4-5), the robber first asks him who he is, to which he replies that he is a Christian, and the robber then asks him if he is afraid, which he denies. The question about fear seems to arise naturally out of Martin's affirmation of his Christianity, and is tantamount to a test of the truth of the claim.

Ælfric changes the order of the questions and reframes them:

> þa ongan se hine befrinan hwæðer he forht wære .
> oððe hwæt he manna wære . oþþe he cristen wære .
> (Skeat, 230/157-8)

The question about fear thus loses the significance given it by Sulpicius since it is not related to Martin's affirmation of his Christianity. Instead, it contributes to the drama and plausibility of the scene as the kind of question that a robber might well ask of a victim he was hoping to intimidate. The second question, "oððe hwæt he manna wære", is a free translation of Sulpicius' "quisnam esset". Ælfric's rephrasing of the rest of the question, "oþþe he cristen wære", is clearly based on Martin's reply in the *Vita*, "respondit Christianus se esse". In the Latin text this reply is not a logical response to the question framed by the robber, "quisnam esset" (*Vita*, 5/4), but the *non sequitur* has purpose: Martin's refusal to make a direct reply by giving his name shows that he considers his name to be of secondary importance and that he feels himself to be characterised primarily by his identity as a Christian. In Ælfric's version, Martin makes no direct statement of his faith, but it is inferred by the robber from his behaviour. This is typical of Ælfric and is ultimately more convincing to the reader or listener, since the awareness of Martin's Christianity emerges out of the events of the episode rather than out of his own stated opinion of himself.

3. Modification for the contemporary audience

One of Ælfric's major concerns is to present material that is appropriate to his audience and this is reflected on a number of occasions where he modifies his sources so that the matter dealt with can be more readily understood by his audience. With reference to the *Life of St Martin* in particular, G.H. Gerould[12] points out Ælfric's selectiveness about the inclusion of place-names, since he retains only those which his audience will be likely to recognise. Similarly, when listing the disguises under which the Devil appears to Martin, Ælfric retains the names of the Roman gods, but also gives their northern equivalents:

> hwilon on ioues hiwe . þe is ge-haten þor .
> hwilon on mercuries . þe men hatað oðon .
> hwilon on ueneris þære fulan gyden .
> þe men hatað fricg . . . (Skeat, 264/714-17)

The admonition, of which this forms a part, was both appropriate and topical, since Ælfric was writing when Christianity in the north of England was under threat from the Norse religion.[13]

Alteration in church practice also causes Ælfric to adapt his source material, as he does in his Section VII, when describing the way of life in the monastery established by Martin at Marmoutiers. Sulpicius tells us:

> Rarus cuiquam extra cellulam suam egressus, nisicum ad locum orationis conveniebant. (*Vita*, 10/7)

Ælfric omits this reference, probably because the monastic life-style of his own day no longer meant that monks lived apart in separate buildings, meeting only for prayers and meals. Similarly in Section XIII, Ælfric alters Sulpicius' description of the marvellous effect of Martin's preaching to the heathens. Sulpicius tells us that Martin often preached so effectively that "ipsi sua templa subverterent" (*Vita*, 15/4). Ælfric, however, perhaps remembering Gregory the Great's injunction to Augustine not to destroy the pagan temples but to convert them to the service of the true God,[14] alters this so that the outcome of Martin's conversion of the heathens conforms with the way in which the early conversions were carried out in England:

> þa bodode he him swa lange
> þone soðan ge-leafan . oð-þæt he ge-liþe-wæhte .
> to geleafan heora wurðfullan templ .
> (Skeat, 250/481-83)

In both cases, of course, the idols themselves were destroyed.

On other occasions Ælfric reinterprets events in his source in a way that reflects his own sense of propriety in personal belief, which tends to be orthodox rather than highly individual. An instance of his conformity is his treatment of the Antichrist theme, which occurs in Section XXII, after the account of the upsurge of false prophets. Ælfric adopts a very "safe" orthodox attitude to this topic, expressing the conventional view that Antichrist will be preceded by false prophets, but not taking the opportunity to sound the knell of doom as does Sulpicius in his account:

> Ex quo conicere possumus, istius modi pseudoprofetis existentibus, Antichristi adventum imminere, qui iam in istis mysterium iniquitatis operatur.
> (*Vita*, 24/3)

Of course, Sulpicius was writing some six hundred years before Ælfric so that, for the Old English writer, the specific examples given would be inappropriate, but nevertheless the theme was a current one and could have been applicable to Ælfric's own age. Other preachers - Wulfstan, for example - were ready enough to exploit the theme, and Ælfric refers to it. Ælfric retains the general statement about the forces of evil, but makes no specific application of it:

eac swilce lease witegan ær þisre worulde ge-endunge
on gehwilce land cumað . and þone ge-leafan amyrrað .
oð-þæt antecrist sylf ende-next becym .
(Skeat, 272/842-44)

The sense of moderation displayed here is very characteristic and, as pointed out by Gerould,[15] this moderation also guides his selection of material from Gregory of Tours' *De Virtutibus Sancti Martini*. It is further illustrated in his account of Martin's conduct just before he is trapped in a fire. Sulpicius portrays Martin as a rigorous ascetic at this point:

insuetam mollitiem strati male blandientis horrescit.
(*Epistula* I, 10)

This provides a dramatic explanation for the outbreak of the fire. In Ælfric's *Life*, however, this part of the episode has no direct connection with the fire (a point to which I shall return) and thus amounts to a complete episode in its own right. Nevertheless, Ælfric makes the scene less striking; he mitigates Martin's extreme reaction, so that his behaviour is much more normal, and also furnishes an example more practicable for Ælfric's audience to follow:

þa on-scunede he þa softnysse . þære seltcuðan beddinge .
(Skeat, 272/854)

In keeping with the attitudes which the two writers display here is the treatment accorded by each of them to the first anecdote illustrating Martin's saintliness, when he clothes the beggar at the gates of Amiens (Skeat, 222/57ff.; *Vita*, Ch. 3). Ælfric presents the deed as a simple act of charity; it is pity that constrains Martin to help the man:

Martinus þa ongeat þæt he moste his helpan .
þa ða þa oðra noldon . (Skeat, 224/64-5)

However, Sulpicius makes this almost a mystical experience, where Martin consciously feels himself to be responding to God's selection of him personally:

Intellexit vir Deo plenus sibi illum, aliis misericordiam non praestantibus, reservari.
(*Vita*, 3/1)

We feel that, although he has already exhibited many signs of his promise as a Christian, this incident is the true turning-point of his commitment, leading on to complete dedication to God. This is then reinforced by his vision of Christ. In his version, on the other hand, Ælfric loses this exposure of Martin's psychological and spiritual state, but gains in his expression of a simple act of practical charity, which can be understood and emulated by all members of his audience.

Although it is usual for Ælfric to portray Martin in a more simple and human light than does Sulpicius, the reverse of this occurs in the episode where Martin exposes a cult of the burial place of a false martyr. In Sulpicius' account we learn that Martin is doubtful about the belief:

> Sed Martinus non temere adhibens incertis fidem . . .
> (*Vita*, 11/2)

Ælfric states directly and firmly:

> Martinus þa ne ge-lyfde þam leasum ge-dwimore .
> (Skeat, 240/346)

In the *Vita*, the lack of satisfactory answers to Martin's questions leaves him uncommitted:

> Cum aliquandiu ergo a loco illo se abstinuisset, nec derogans religioni, quia incertus erat, nec auctoritatem suam vulgo adcommodans, ne superstitio convalescerat.
> (*Vita*, 11/3)

He eventually sets out to discover the truth. In Ælfric's version, on the other hand, his failure to obtain sure information reinforces his earlier opinion and he forbids people to visit the place (Skeat, 242/351), a direct contradiction of Sulpicius. Ælfric may well have felt that there was some ambiguity in Martin's having doubts on the subject, for Sulpicius is often at pains to point out Martin's foresight (see, for example, *Vita*, 21/5). This aspect of Martin's saintliness is stressed still more by Ælfric, particularly since he is anxious that all issues should be clear and uncomplicated to suit the needs of his audience. Thus, it is important for him to portray Martin's conduct at all times as in keeping with the character established for him.

Ælfric's modifications are carried out in order to make his material readily comprehensible and to fit in with Anglo-Saxon culture, and they are generally successful in this respect. However, on one occasion this technique is itself a cause of confusion. In his account of Martin's escape from the fire, Sulpicius explains in detail the circumstances which give rise to the conflagration (*Epistula* I, 10), and he seems to be describing a hypocaust system:

> mansionem ei in secretario ecclesiae clerici paraverunt multumque ignem scabro iam et pertenui pavimento subdiderunt. (*Epistula* I, 10)

This Roman method of heating would have been unknown to the majority of Anglo-Saxons and may indeed have been unfamiliar to Ælfric himself, so when he comes to describe the fire he writes only,

> . . . . and þær micel fyr wæs gebet,
> (Skeat, 272/847)

We learn later that the fire was simply "on þære flora" (Skeat, 272/850), which is the usual Anglo-Saxon method of heating a room, and which thus gives no occasion for confusion or distraction from the main point of the story. But the disadvantage of Ælfric's brief statement is as follows. In Sulpicius' account the cast-off bedding lay on the broken paving, so that the fire caught it some time after it had been thrown off. Since the fire in Ælfric's version is quite open in the room, there could have been no delay before the straw caught alight. Thus, Ælfric is forced to treat the rejection of the bedding as an event which has nothing to do with the outbreak of the fire, and he is left with no real explanation of this:

> þa wearð þæt fyr ontend swyðe færlicum bryne .
> and þæt litle hus mid þam lige afylde .
> (Skeat, 272/858-9)

4. Ælfric and Blickling Homily XVIII

Ælfric's ambitious approach and his skill in the execution of his techniques of selecting, reordering and modifying material is particularly evident when one compares his longer *Life* with some slightly earlier accounts of Martin's life that use the same Latin source. Three such are Blickling Homily XVIII,[16] Vercelli Homily XVIII,[17] and MS Oxford Bodleian Junius 86, ff.62-81.[18]

As Napier has shown, there is a clear relationship between the three homilies, and the wording is identical at many points, so that it seems probable that they were all descended from the same primary source.[19] The Blickling MS can be assigned to 971,[20] while the Vercelli collection and MS Bodleian Junius 86 are thought to have been compiled slightly earlier.[21] The original homily from which these accounts appear to have descended was probably composed early in the tenth century, while Ælfric's *Life* was written at the end of that century. Since the Blickling homily is the most complete of the three versions it will be convenient to use Blickling alone for the following comparisons.

The differences between Ælfric's account of Martin and that in the Blickling collection were conditioned partly by the circumstances in which each was written and partly by the different methods and skills of the two writers. The Blickling homily was intended for oral delivery, as is made clear in the homilist's opening address, "Men þa leofestan . . ." (Morris, 211/1). Ælfric's *Life* could equally well be listened to or read, as he himself states in his Preface:

> Hunc quoque codicem transtulimus de Latinitate ad usitatem Anglicam sermocinationem, studentes aliis prodesse edificando ad fidem lectione huius narrationis quibuscumque placuerit huic operam dare, sive legendo, seu Audiendo.[22]

It may, therefore, be expected that Ælfric will aim for greater literary finish than the Blickling homilist, even apart from the writers' differences of skill.

Blickling Homily XVIII differs from Ælfric's *Life* in that it relies for its source material almost exclusively on Sulpicius' *Vita*, only drawing on his *Epistula Tertia* for the essential account of Martin's death. Apart from the account of the death itself, very little purely biographical material is presented and the homily is composed as a sequence of eight episodes, each containing an incident or group of similar incidents, narrated in alternation with passages of general description, which briefly cover the events of Martin's personal life.

The incidents selected are concerned with Martin's miracles and conversion of the heathen, and reflect the homilist's interest in presenting his audience with an instantly recognisable portrait of a saint.[23] This aim is to some extent shared by Ælfric, but the structure of his *Life of St Martin* is so much more complex and incorporates so much more material that he succeeds in presenting a genuine biography, a faithful record (at least according to his sources) of Martin's career. The account in Blickling might rather be characterised as a collection of anecdotes within a biographical framework.

Ælfric shows greater skill in the adaptation and organisation of material, while Blickling is content to follow the *Vita* in the order of events and in the details of those incidents which are selected. Even the passages of general commentary which link the episodes proper are derived from the *Vita* and occur in the same order. It is also noteworthy that the Blickling homilist does not attempt to avoid repetition where it is found in Sulpicius, despite the fact that his brief selection of incidents from the *Vita* would suggest that brevity was one of his aims. This is illustrated by the passage, derived from the *Vita*, Chaps. 7-8, describing Martin's revival of two dead men. As I have commented (p. 27 above), Ælfric does not follow Sulpicius in repeating the description of the second man's reawakening. This is not the case with the Blickling homilist, who continues to follow the *Vita* closely and, indeed, carries this further by repeating the description of Martin's own reactions, although Sulpicius himself omits this in the second incident (*Vita*, 8/3).

In keeping with this rather slavish adherence to Sulpicius is the fact that the translation from the Latin is often very literal in Blickling, even to the extent of rendering "duodeviginti" as "twæm læs þe twentig" (Morris, 215/34). The homilist's indebtedness to his source is also expressed in a number of Latin quotations that are included in the text, always with explanatory translations following them, although no open acknowledgement of Sulpicius is made.[24] It is worth noticing that although Blickling generally provides the more literal translation of the Latin, the clumsier phraseology has less in common with Sulpicius than has Ælfric's prose, rich in rhetorical skills, albeit of a different kind from those of Sulpicius. Indeed, Ælfric's awareness of and debt to the patterns of Latin prose has been pointed out by many scholars.[25]

This, perhaps, is why it is the Blickling homilist, rather than Ælfric, who feels it necessary to display his Latin scholarship by including Latin quotations in his text.

As I have suggested above, the narrative technique of Blickling can only be described as clumsy. There is little attempt at linkage between episodes, and each new incident is introduced with a variant of the stock phrase, "þæt gelamp sume siðe" (e.g. Morris, 213/29), despite the fact that Sulpicius makes chronological or thematic links between certain episodes, although inconsistently. Again, it is Ælfric who remains truer to the spirit of Sulpicius' writing, since he uses linkage successfully and judiciously, although his phrasing is often independent of Sulpicius.

In particular, the narrative technique of the two Old English writers exemplifies the difference in skill between them. The language of Blickling is simple in construction, with a tendency to prolixity and needless repetition, while Ælfric uses a more complex medium with greater control. The comparative inadequacy of the Blickling homilist's manipulation of language is illustrated by the following passage, from the episode describing the revival of the first dead man:

> þa he þa Sanctus Martinus þæt geseah, þæt þa oðre broðor ealle swa unrote ymb þæt lic utan stondan, þa weop he & eode into him. & him wæs þæt swiðe myccle weorce þæt he swa ungefulwad forðferan sceolde; getrywde þa hweðre mid ealle mode on Ælmihtiges Godes miht & on his mildheortnesse. & eode þa on þa cetan þær se lichoma inne wæs, & heht þa oðre men ut gangan, & þa ða duru inbeleac æfter him. & hine þa gebæd, & hine astreahte ofer leomu þæs deadan mannes. (Morris, 217/19-27)

Martin's entry into the cell is stated, but a digression then follows, in which the homilist points out Martin's trust in God. This is an element that is implicit in Sulpicius' account at a later point, when Martin's confident expectation of God's mercy is described (*Vita*, 7/3). Ælfric follows Sulpicius' technique (Skeat, 232/212), but the Blickling homilist finds it necessary to insert an explicit statement early in the course of events and, having done so, has to resume the narrative by repeating Martin's entry into the cell.

It can also be seen from the passage quoted that sentence structure is generally very simple; subordinate clauses are rare and the structure is most often paratactic. It is this inability of the homilist to provide parenthetical information or commentary through the arrangement of subordinate clauses that forces him to break the line of the narrative.

This lack of sophistication in style is also reflected in the nature of the vocabulary of Blickling Homily XVIII. In the introduction to his edition of the *Blickling Homilies* (pp.v-vi), Morris mentions the archaic quality of much of the vocabulary of the homilies and draws attention to the fact that it has more in common with the unsophisticated prose of the ninth century than

with the more polished prose of the Benedictine Revival period.

In comparing Ælfric's *Life* with the Blickling Homily on St Martin, one is left with a sense that, although they differ slightly in intention, the two Old English homilists are writing in the same tradition but with great disparity in their literary abilities. On the other hand, in comparing Sulpicius' work with that of Ælfric, one has an impression of equal skills, but varying purposes and traditions of composition, which account to a great extent for the differences between them. The *Vita* is a work designed to be read privately and thus its style is highly rhetorical, involving complex syntax and the rhythms and rhyme associated with the art of Latin prose composition of the period. In comparison, Ælfric's style appears bare and direct, yet close examination of his work reveals that he uses language equally skilfully but with less ostentation. His *Life of St Martin* is designed equally to be listened to or read privately, and thus he narrates simply and directly, always expressing his meaning concisely and clearly in his alliterative and rhythmic prose, so that he combines simplicity and clarity with artistry. The organisation of his material and his subtle use of rhetorical skills make the work a pleasure to read, as it must have been also to hear.[26]

NOTES

[1] See for example G.H. Gerould, "Abbot Ælfric's Rhythmic Prose", *MP* 22 (1925) pp.353-66; D. Bethurum, "The Form of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*", *Studies in Philology* 29 (1925) pp.516-33.

[2] "Ælfric and Abbo of Fleury", *English Studies* 49 (1968) pp.30-6.

[3] *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, II, ed. W.W. Skeat, EETS, OS 94, 114 (1890, 1900; reprinted as one volume, 1966) pp.218-312. Subsequent references to Ælfric's longer *Life of St Martin* are by page and line number as printed in Skeat's edition, except where it is occasionally more convenient to use Skeat's section numbers.

[4] "Ælfric's Lives of St Martin of Tours", *JEGP* 24 (1925) pp.206-10.

[5] *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. The Second Series. Text*, ed. M. Godden, EETS, SS 5 (1979) pp.288-98.

[6] See P. Clemoes, "The Chronology of Ælfric's Work", in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. P. Clemoes (London, 1959) pp.212-47.

[7] For an edition of the *Vita Sancti Martini* (hereafter referred to as *Vita*), see *Sulpice Sévère: Vie de Saint Martin*, I, ed. J. Fontaine, Sources Chrétiennes 133 (Paris, 1967). This edition also includes the texts of Sulpicius' supplementary *Epistles* about the life of Martin. All subsequent references to the *Vita* and *Epistles* are to this edition. References to the *Vita* will be by chapter and section number, while references to the Epistles will be by section number alone.

[8] Sulpicius Severus, *Dialogi*, ed. J.P. Migne, PL 20 (Paris, 1845) cols. 183-222. Subsequent references will be to the number of the dialogue and the chapter.

[9] Gregory of Tours, "De Virtutibus Sancti Martini", ed. B. Krusch, in *Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum*, I, MGH (Hanover, 1885) pp.585-661.

[10] *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, I, ed. W.W. Skeat, EETS, OS 76, 82 (1881, 1885; reprinted as one volume, 1966) p.4, ll.25-8.

[11] "Ælfric and Abbo of Fleury", p.31.

[12] "Ælfric's Lives of St Martin of Tours", p.209.

[13] See also Ælfric's "De Falsis Diis", in *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, II, EETS, OS 260 (1968) pp.667-75; Wulfstan's "De Falsis Deis", in *The Homilies of Wulfstan*, ed. D. Bethurum (Oxford, 1957) pp.221-24.

[14] Bede, *Historia Gentis Anglorum*, ed. C. Plummer, Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica (Oxford, 1896), I, p.65 (Lib. I, Cap. XXX).

[15] "Ælfric's Lives of St Martin of Tours", p.209.

[16] *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Morris, EETS, OS 58, 63, 73 (1874, 1876, 1880; reprinted as one volume, 1957) pp.211-27. All references are to the page and line number of this edition.

[17] *Vercelli Homilies IX-XXIII*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Toronto, 1981) pp.57-67.

[18] This has not yet been printed. My thanks are due to the Librarian of the Bodleian Library for his permission to consult the manuscript.

[19] A.S. Napier, "Notes on the *Blickling Homilies*", *MP* 1 (1903) pp.303-8. Napier has established that none of the manuscripts is a copy of one of the others, since the differences in the readings are inconsistent with this. Where the readings vary, Vercelli and Junius are most frequently in agreement: twenty instances are cited where they both differ from Blickling, while Blickling and Junius share readings not in Vercelli on six occasions.

[20] Morris, p.v.

[21] D.G. Scragg, "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric", *Anglo-Saxon England* 8 (1979) pp.223-70. The date of the Vercelli Collection is discussed on p.225, while the Blickling and Junius MSS are discussed on pp.234-6.

[22] *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, I, p.l.

[23] Similar observations are made by Paul Szarmach with reference to the selection of material in Vercelli Homily XVIII; see "The Vercelli Homilies: Style and Structure", in *The Old English Homily and its Background*, ed. P. Szarmach and B. Huppé (Albany, 1978) pp.258-9.

[24] These Latin phrases are not a feature of the Vercelli or Junius versions of Martin's life, and thus represent a major point of difference between the homilies.

[25] See, for example, F.R. Lipp, "Ælfric's Old English Prose Style", *Studies in Philology* 66 (1969) pp.689-718; G.H. Gerould, "Abbot Ælfric's Rhythmic Prose".

[26] This paper originally formed part of a dissertation written for the degree of MA at the University of Leeds. My thanks are due to my supervisor, Dr Joyce Hill, for her constant advice and encouragement, and also to Mr R.L. Thomson, for his assistance with the Latin text of the *Vita*.

THE WIFE OF BATH AND HER TALE

By N.F. BLAKE

Of the characters in the *Canterbury Tales* the Wife of Bath has aroused most interest and comment among modern scholars. She is seen as a character who developed in complexity as the poem progressed and consequently as one who fascinated her creator. This attitude is expressed most forcefully by R.A. Pratt:

> In the course of years the poet's conception of her changed and developed; the complexity and appeal of her personality are no accident; for, when all the evidence is in, she appears to have interested Chaucer more, to have stimulated his imagination and creative power more fully and over a longer period, than any other of his characters.[1]

Pratt based this approach to her upon certain assumptions about the progress of the text of the poem. These are "that the Man of Law originally told the story of *Melibee*; that his Epilogue originally introduced the Wife of Bath; and that she originally told the tale of adultery now assigned to the Shipman".[2] Recent research into the manuscript tradition of the *Canterbury Tales* has made these assumptions less acceptable today and some have never been accepted by many scholars at all. It is necessary, therefore, to review briefly the state of manuscript scholarship for the poem.

Although many early scholars like Skeat accepted that Hengwrt (Hg) was an early, or even the earliest, manuscript and that Ellesmere (El) was an "edited" text, it has been customary to use El as the base manuscript of editions because it has been traditionally regarded as a good manuscript.[3] It was not fully appreciated until Manly and Rickert produced their edition of the poem in 1940 how good a text Hg was.[4] They relied principally on Hg but they did not use it as their base manuscript, partly because they believed in two types of manuscript production, commercial and non-commercial, and partly because Hg has an unusual order and excludes material traditionally accepted as Chaucerian. Since then editions have continued to use El, except that Donaldson took Hg as the base text of his edition and more recently the Variorum edition and Blake have used or are using Hg more exclusively as their base texts.[5]

Manly and Rickert thought that individual tales of the poem were circulated independently by Chaucer and that these tales existed in different authorial versions. However, the work of

Dempster on the text of the poem showed that there was a coherent manuscript tradition in which all manuscripts could be traced back to Hg and this made the postulate of previously circulating tales unnecessary.[6] More recently Doyle and Parkes have shown that most early manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales* were produced by scribes working on a piece-work basis for an editorial committee.[7] These scribes were working in the London/Westminster area and there was a close link between the early manuscripts of the poem. Their conclusions indicate that the concept of commercial and non-commercial manuscript production is no longer valid, and that these early scribes were all probably working from the same copytext, which is likely to have been Chaucer's own working copy found by members of the editorial committee among his papers after his death. This situation helps to account for the state of Hg which, as outlined by Doyle and Parkes, represents the first attempt by this editorial committee to arrange a series of disparate fragments into a coherent whole. During the course of their first arrangement of the fragments in Hg they realised that certain changes in order were desirable; only some of these were introduced into Hg itself which was already being copied, and others were incorporated into the later manuscripts.[8] It is for this reason that Hg appears to us to be disorganised, although there is a recognisable principle of order in it. The order followed is not the dramatic one to which we have been accustomed, but a more formal arrangement by which tales were grouped according to the state of completion in which they were found. The arrangement of the tales in an order in Hg exposed certain gaps between those tales which were not provided with links, and so extra lines were added to the poem in the course of the fifteenth century in order to make it seem as complete as possible. In the light of our present knowledge it consequently seems safest to accept as genuine Chaucer only those parts of the poem which are in Hg. Thus the Man of Law's endlink, which was almost certainly composed to produce a link between two tales in a fifteenth-century order, should be regarded as spurious. It can therefore have no bearing on Chaucer's attitude to the Wife of Bath, as claimed by Pratt. Indeed it has not been accepted as genuine by all modern editors. This new understanding of the manuscript tradition supports the view that the poem consisted of no more than a series of fragments when Chaucer died and that these fragments or sections had not been arranged in an order by Chaucer. It also suggests that the allocation of tale to teller is something which happened late in the genesis of a tale, for it appears in Hg that some of the tales were allocated tellers by the scribe or the editorial committee rather than by Chaucer.[9]

The other two assumptions made by Pratt were that the Man of Law was first given TMel as his tale and that the Wife of Bath originally told ShT. Of these the latter is widely accepted by all scholars, though the former has won little general acceptance. The assumption about the Man of Law is based on the statement in his prologue that he will tell a tale in prose: "I speke in prose" (3:96). Yet there are several discrepancies between the tale and what is foreshadowed about it in the prologue, and it is not satisfactory to pick out this one alone as significant. Furthermore, it has recently been argued that "prose" may refer to the

rhymed stanzas of equal length as used by the Man of Law.[10] Even if this is not so, there is no evidence that it was TMel to which the Man of Law refers with his "prose". It could have been PsT or a tale that Chaucer intended to write, but never did; or the discrepancy could be of no significance whatever. There is therefore insufficient evidence to support this assumption.

Although the view that the Wife of Bath originally told ShT is universally accepted by modern critics, the evidence for it is not reliable. At the beginning of this tale (ll.11-19) the narrator mentions that a husband must feed and clothe his wife. He does so by using the personal pronouns "we" and "us" to indicate the wife or women in general who are so looked after. These pronouns are felt to be inappropriate for the shipman, a male, and so scholars assume that they refer to the original teller of the tale who was a woman. The paucity of married women on the pilgrimage means that this woman can be only the Wife of Bath. Although this view seems superficially attractive, a consideration of the pronoun forms in the poem makes it less likely. First person pronoun forms are used for emphasis or local colour in other places in the *Canterbury Tales* and their use here need not be regarded as significant. Furthermore the pronoun forms are among those which are most frequently corrected by the fifteenth-century scribes. Yet these particular examples at the beginning of ShT are not altered by any scribe, and so it would appear that the scribes did not feel them to be so out of place as we today evidently do.[11] As we have already noted that in Hg there is evidence to indicate that the tales were often written before they were ascribed to a particular teller, it is more satisfactory to assume that at the beginning of ShT the personal pronouns like "we" and "us" were introduced for vividness and not that they are relics of an earlier version of the tale.

In the light of our present knowledge we may reasonably conclude that the Wife of Bath was not associated by Chaucer with any other tale and that she herself did not have a role in any linking sequence outside her own section. That section contains WBPT, FrT and SuT only. How that section came to be put together and in what order are unknown. Before the composition of this section is considered, its connections with other tales need to be looked at. In traditional scholarship WBPT is thought to introduce and be the principal tale in the so-called Marriage Group, though that idea has been under increasing attack more recently. Clearly if, as suggested by recent scholarship, the *Canterbury Tales* consisted at Chaucer's death of a group of unordered sections there can be no evidence that Chaucer intended a Marriage Group at all. All we can say is that Chaucer linked WBPT with FrT and SuT and made references to the Wife of Bath in ClT and MeT. Certainly when Hg was copied the scribe was not thinking in terms of a Marriage Group. The original intention in Hg was apparently to put the Wife of Bath section before PsT at the end of the poem. This may be, as has been suggested,[12] because the editor who arranged the sections thought the Summoner's concluding remark "We been almoost at towne" (2:2268) referred to Canterbury. This section was not ultimately placed before PsT in Hg because the scribe or editor realised that there were references to the Wife in ClT and MeT and that it was not

suitable for her tale to follow those tales; WBPT was therefore brought forward in Hg. As this realisation emerged only during the course of the copying of Hg, ClT and MeT cannot have been linked to the Wife of Bath in its exemplar. That Chaucer may have intended at some later stage to make some connection between WBPT and ClT and MeT is a possible hypothesis, but it is too speculative to be taken into account in a discussion of the poem's development. The only tales which are known to be linked by Chaucer to the Wife of Bath's are SuT and FrT, and the section they formed was an independent one among the fragments of the poem left by Chaucer when he died.

As for the composition of WBP it has been claimed that it consists of several parts and that these witness to various stages in the prologue's growth, which in turn reflect Chaucer's continued interest and involvement in the Wife herself.[13] The prologue may for critical purposes be divided into two parts, the 'sermon' on marriage and virginity on the one hand, and the description of the Wife's marriages on the other. This does not mean that the two parts were necessarily composed at different times. No manuscript contains only the one or other part, and so the only support for this idea of a serial-type composition is individual scholars' subjective reactions. Yet the prologue relies on several different sources, and the differences in tone and approach may reflect those sources. This is something that happens frequently in the poem. Thus the theme of poverty in MLT (3:99-133) fits in awkwardly with the tale of Constance, but we need not accept that this is because these two parts of MLT were written by Chaucer at separate times; they indicate the use of different sources. As there is no evidence in the manuscripts to support several stages in its composition, we may accept that WBP was written as one unit and that consequently by itself it provides no clue as to Chaucer's developing attitude to the Wife of Bath.

There are, however, differences in the number of lines found in WBP in the various manuscripts. Hg, together with other early manuscripts like Harley 7334, has far fewer lines than some manuscripts. It does not have the lines which appear in the Group/Fragment lineation as 44a-f, 575-84, 609-12, 619-26 and 717-20. El itself does not contain 44a-f, but it does have the other sets of lines. The attitude of most editors is that these lines (with the possible exception of 44a-f) were added in revision by Chaucer, though it is never made clear if they were all added at the same time or how one can tell they are Chaucerian. Because they are not in Hg, it is more satisfactory to regard them as scribal rather than as authorial, for we know the scribes were active in adding to what Chaucer left of the *Canterbury Tales* at his death. In any event WBP is the most altered piece in the poem. Whether the additions are in fact authorial or scribal, there can be no doubt that the prologue once existed in a shorter version than the one in which it is now usually read. It is from this shorter version that studies on the development of the Wife of Bath should commence, since it is a fact in the manuscript tradition as against the surmises of who originally told which tale. This shorter version may give us some indication of the poet's original attitude to the Wife which the

later additions may have altered.

What then do these additional passages consist of? In the first (44a-f) the Wife claims she has extracted the best out of her husbands and that she represents the embodiment of the experience of having five husbands. In the second (575-84) she misleads her husband about her dreams and their significance. In the third (609-12) she claims to be compounded of Martian and Venerian elements. In the fourth (619-26) she maintains that she is marked by Mars and so cannot live moderately, but is willing to love any man. The final addition (717-20) mentions that Christ died to redeem a woman's fault for it was a woman, Eve, who brought mankind to ruin. This last addition is a typical piece of medieval moralising and is very different from the others. The import of those is to make the Wife even more colourful and outrageous. The reviser has increased the impact the Wife makes upon the reader. There is no attempt, for example, to increase the examples of wicked wives or to add to the more argumentative passages of the prologue; the additions, with the exception of the last one, are concerned with the character of the Wife herself. Although this may not surprise us, it indicates that when she was first created she was not meant to be so colourful; she became more "popular" as time passed. She grew bigger than her creator originally imagined or intended.

There is other evidence to support this suggestion. The Wife is the only pilgrim referred to outside the *Canterbury Tales*. In the *Envoy to Bukton* (conventionally dated about 1396) she appears as the typical tyrannical wife who makes marriage such a risky business. Here she has acquired the status of a symbol. Furthermore, the Wife is the only pilgrim mentioned by other pilgrims in their tales (as distinct from the links). The Clerk and Merchant refer to her explicitly. The former implies in a passing reference that she stands as the representative of her sex, probably in its more aggressive manifestations. The "song" with which his tale ends is a sop to placate the Wife for his tale about a patient and prudent wife. In MeT Justinus the wise counsellor refers to the Wife and her exposition of the marriage state in his claim that marriage is not likely to prove as happy as January imagines so he need not worry about spoiling his chances of going to paradise because of happiness in marriage. In these three examples in Chaucer's own work,[14] all of which must be dated after WBPT, the Wife stands as a symbol of the woman who tyrannises her husband and who asserts women's rights against men. She has grown so large that she can stand outside the framework of section 2 of the *Canterbury Tales* to represent a particular type of woman.

The relationship of WBP in its shorter version to the description of the Wife in Pro is less easy to decide. It is widely believed that Pro was composed before most, if not all, of the tales, though some scholars have suggested that its portrait of the Wife was touched up after WBP was written.[15] While there is nothing inherently improbable in this suggestion, it is unnecessary to posit a special case for the Wife's portrait unless compelling reasons exist to support it. As the Wife's portrait in Pro is in many respects quite contrary to what we learn of her in WBP, such reasons do not seem to exist. In Pro she is a weaver of excellence

with the implication that she acquired her independence and wealth from that profession. Consequently she considered herself the premier woman in the parish and was angry if others tried to usurp her position. Because of her wealth and position she dressed extravagantly. She had been married five times and she had also indulged in extra-marital affairs. Her constant journeys on pilgrimage were presumably undertaken to satisfy that particular proclivity. She was jolly and she knew all about love. There is no hint here of the tyrannical wife who made her husbands endure hell on earth. A straightforward reading of

> Housbondes at chirche-dore she hadde fyue
> Withouten oother compaignye in yowthe -
> But therof nedeth noght to speke as nowthe. (1: 462-4)

implies that her many marriages were embarked on to indulge sexual appetite and not to acquire wealth or to give scope for her bullying behaviour. In Pro the Wife is a rich, jolly oversexed woman who must satisfy her desires either in or out of marriage. Her wealth and position give her the opportunity to indulge herself in this way. There is no reason, therefore, to suggest that this portrait was written after WBP or in any way influenced by the information given there. If Pro was written before the majority of tales, this would fit in with the view that the portrait of the Wife in Pro precedes the description of her behaviour in WBP.

From the foregoing discussion it is possible to suggest there were at least four stages in the development of the Wife of Bath. The first is represented by Pro where the Wife appears as a rich, companionable woman whose primary interest in life is sex; she was experienced in the art of love. This is natural in a character modelled on La Vielle in *Le Roman de la Rose*. The second is found in the shorter version of WBP in which the Wife is portrayed as a tyrant because of the role she fills in that section of the poem. The third is represented by the references to her in the *Envoy to Bukton* and the tales of the Merchant and Clerk. Here the Wife is taken out of the context of her tale and she is treated as a symbol of the tyrannical wife pure and simple. The Wife has developed a life of her own outside her tale: she has become a "character". The fourth is represented by the additions in WBP in which her stature as an independent character has influenced her role and representation in her own prologue. While the first three stages may be accepted as Chaucerian, the last may be (and almost certainly is) scribal. As we have seen, the early scribes probably worked from one exemplar and as the majority of early manuscripts (with the exception of El) omit these extra lines of the last stage, it is probable that they were not in the exemplar.[16] If they were included in the margin by Chaucer as a revision of his text, we should need to know why the early scribes ignored them. It is more reasonable to assume that the passages were introduced by a scribe or editor during the early fifteenth century.

The proposals that have been put forward to explain the genesis of Pro are varied and need not be discussed in detail here. Among them the suggestion by Dr Mann that Chaucer was influenced

by medieval estates satire seems most satisfactory to account for the portrayal of the Wife.[17] She stands as the representative of woman, a recognised type for criticism in that literature, and many features Chaucer included in Pro exploit the contemporary moralist's attitude towards women. This concentrated on women's sexual role, which was evaluated against the ideal woman in courtly love who was a passive partner. Hence the aspects stressed by Chaucer are the Wife's independence, assertiveness and sexuality - features not associated with the perfect medieval woman in literature. Instead of remaining faithful to her husband or his memory, she glories in sex: she marries five times and has the odd affair. This feature is sufficient to show that Pro preceded WBP in the Chaucerian canon. In sexual affairs variety and prowess are important attributes, as they are in Pro. When in WBP the Wife becomes a tyrant, the five husbands become an embarrassment. To solve the difficulty Chaucer amalgamated three of the husbands - an indication he was dealing with intractable material. The Wife's independence which she gains in Pro through her weaving business is another feature which is important in Pro but has no relevance to WBP where it is ignored. This independence enables her to follow her sexual passion. She is a woman who chases her quarry rather than acts as the object of a man's service, and consequently she is distanced from the ideal woman. Independence is not necessary in WBP where Chaucer wanted to portray a tyrant who had little reason to act in that way since she had sprung from such humble origins. She tyrannised her husbands and appropriated their wealth. Her behaviour is typical of the usurping tyrant who does not know how to behave properly because she is not born to that status. Her jaunts on pilgrimage in Pro are a further mark of her independence; she goes to satisfy her sexual desires. In WBP this feature is not developed because the Wife stays at home to tyrannise her husbands. Similarly her love of finery and her pride over her fellow wives which are important characteristics in Pro are not stressed in WBP where her relations with her husbands are more important. Indeed, she criticises her husband because she is not so finely dressed as her neighbours.

In other words the Wife of Bath is portrayed as two different types in Pro and WBP. In the former Chaucer uses the theme of the satirised woman of estates literature, whereas in the latter he uses the theme of the tyrant in its special form of the tyrannical wife. Consequently many features in Pro are not developed in WBP because they are inappropriate to the new character the Wife assumes there. Some features in Pro do recur in WBP, such as her deafness and her gat-toothed mouth; even the marriage to five husbands is repeated. But these features are either mentioned in WBP only in passing or they are handled in a different way because of her different role. It is also not unimportant to note that in section 2 WBPT is linked with the tales of the Friar and the Summoner and that WBP is interrupted by the Pardoner who compliments her on her preaching. These three pilgrims linked with the Wife are among the least attractive on the pilgrimage. They are all hypocritical and motivated by greed. While it does not follow that the Wife is motivated in the same way, it can hardly be fortuitous that she is linked with such unsavoury characters. This grouping implies a less favourable attitude towards her on Chaucer's part

here than in Pro, one which is consonant with the transformation of the jolly, oversexed woman into the tyrannical wife.

In WBPT the tale and the Wife's portrayal in her prologue may be considered separately so that their relationship can be evaluated. The tale itself is uncomplicated and is characterised by its anonymity. The fairytale past is unlocalised apart from its associations with King Arthur. The participants are unnamed: they are referred to as "the knight", "the maiden", "the queen", and "the old woman". None is described in detail or given any distinguishing attributes. Apart from Arthur, the only person named is Midas who appears in an exemplum. In this respect this tale differs from many others in the poem, though PdT is similar. Although that tale is set in Flanders, no exact location or time is specified. Its participants are also referred to by circumlocutions such as "the oldest rioter", "the host" and "the old man". The effect in both cases is to create a tale which has more the nature of an exemplum, though in each case it lacks the liveliness and narrative force of its prologue.

WBT is little concerned with action or narrative. After a brief introduction the scene is set in a mere thirty lines (2: 856-86). In them we learn of the knight, the rape, the death sentence and the postponement of the sentence for a year so the knight can find an answer to the question of what women most desire. The possible answers he receives constitute a long section, as does the exemplum about Midas. The meeting with the old woman and the events at court form a relatively brief middle section, which is overshadowed in length by the discussion in bed between the knight and his new wife on their wedding night. In this discussion the knight complains that his wife is so ugly and meanly born that his heart will break because of his marriage to her. The wife launches into an account of what true nobility is. The burden of this account is that true nobility comes from virtue rather than from birth or worldly possessions. Her disquisition has little to do with the knight's complaint and is part of a common medieval theme. But her claims attack the knight at his weakest spot for he was forced to marry her through lack of virtue: his rape of the maiden was the ultimate cause of his predicament. The knight is punished for his lack of virtue. His rape is an expression of selfishness which he must atone for by submission through marriage to an old and ugly wife. This submission is increased when he allows her to resolve the question of whether she will be ugly and faithful or beautiful and fickle. In this way she achieves what all women desire, rule over their husbands.

> 'Thanne haue I gete of yow maistrye,' quod she,
> 'Syn I may chese and gouerne as me lest.'
> 'Ye certes, wyf,' quod he; 'I holde it best.'
> (2: 1210-12)

The outcome, however, is unexpected. The wife accepts this sovereignty and then acts as though she is the subservient partner by obeying her husband in everything. She slips into the pattern of the courtly wife to whom obeisance is paid, but who does

everything to support the marriage and to uphold the dignity of her husband. The knight for his part also achieves the ideal of the courtly lover in marriage, for he puts his wife above him. He is no longer the selfish bully who takes his pleasure where he will; he is the submissive lover who promotes the benefit of his beloved. The result is an ideal happy marriage, such as that of Arveragus and Dorigen in FkT.

His experience shows that those who suffer for their previous misconduct as the knight himself does in the quest for an answer to the queen's question and in marrying the old hag may win through to happiness and honour. The tyranny of the knightly class over the poor as exemplified by the rape is expunged by the triumph of the poor over that class as exemplified by the marriage - and the result is social equilibrium and harmony. Each recognises the other's rights.

WBP falls into two parts. The first (2: 1-162) contains the sermon on marriage and virginity, in which the traditional teaching of the Church on virginity is put in a different context. Marriage is claimed as part of the divine purpose for man and hence as praiseworthy as virginity. The sermon ends with the Wife's claim that she will exact full sexual payment from her husbands. The Pardoner interrupts her to compliment her on her preaching and to exclaim in horror at the dangers of marriage on which he was about to embark. The Wife replies by reiterating her claim that she was a scourge to her husbands:

> And whan that I haue toold thee forth my tale
> Of tribulacion in maryage,
> Of which I am expert in al myn age
> (This is to seye myself hath been the whippe),
> Thanne maystow chese . . . (2: 172-6)

She underlines her new character as the tyrannous wife. She is no longer a jolly sexual extrovert; she is a scourge. The Pardoner's interruption serves to reinforce this new character.[18] The sermon on virginity and marriage has led the Wife through the position that marriage is praiseworthy to the statement that in marriage sex should be indulged freely with the rider that it is the wife who will in that case be the dominant partner because she controls the sexual act. A wife emerges therefore as a potential tyrant. If virginity leads to self-denial, marriage is an institution where one partner can exploit and so tyrannise the other. This situation is discussed in general terms in the sermon; the second part of WBP (2: 193ff) relates it to the Wife's own marital affairs. WBP proceeds from the general to the particular.

In this second part the Wife relates her experiences with her five husbands. As we have seen, Chaucer amalgamated the first three. They are neither differentiated nor named. They were, as she says, "goode and ryche and olde" (2: 197). They were too old to satisfy the Wife's sexual demands, though she made them try. They gave her their wealth, but she flouted and tyrannised them. They did all they could to soothe her anger and tantrums, but she berated them

unmercifully. This behaviour is not the satisfaction of sexual passion, but the abuse of power. She then gives the pilgrims a long example (2: 235-378) of the things she said to her husbands to torment them. They did not, as she admitted, merit these attacks; but feeling that attack was the best form of defence, she gave them no respite. After these three had died leaving her a rich widow, she married her fourth husband. This husband is somewhat underplayed by Chaucer because he wanted to create a balance between three "good" and two "bad" husbands (cf. 2: 196), but did not want to destroy the climax of the final bad one. Hence the fourth husband's situation is enigmatic. He is unnamed and the details of the marital situation are kept noticeably vague. He had a mistress, but his wife got her own back by making him jealous. Even though he suffered such pangs of anger and jealousy that he deserved to go to heaven, we are not told the details of how this triumph was accomplished. Instead of giving us information about this conflict, the Wife embarks on a series of reminiscences when discussing her fourth husband. It is not clear whether these reminiscences, which deal with the jolly life she led, refer to this period of her career or to her youth in general. The reminiscences are a literary device of filling in space while dealing with the fourth husband without actually dealing with the marriage itself. Chaucer is forced to fudge the fourth husband so that the Wife may seem to be still at the top of her tyrannical power when she encounters her fifth husband against whom the final and conclusive battle is fought, although at the same time he wanted to suggest a relatively neat division of the five husbands into a group of three and a group of two. These irreconcilable demands on the treatment of the fourth husband are a further indication that the description of the husbands in Pro precedes the account in WBP.

The fifth husband is a clerk named Jankin and the episode involving him represents a reversal of the Wife's earlier marital situation. She is now old and rich, and her partner has youth and poverty on his side. Previously she had been poor and young, and her husbands had been rich and old. Indeed, as soon as she marries, she gives Jankin all her wealth just as her previous husbands had bestowed their wealth upon her. Where she was free, she is now restrained; and where she used to preach at her husbands, she must now submit to the preaching of the fifth husband. The many examples from Jankin's book of wicked wives form a straight parallel with the verbal assaults the Wife used to inflict on her husbands. The tables have been turned in a manner which is not dissimilar to that found in her own tale where the poor who are exploited at the beginning come out on top at the end. The crisis in WBP comes when she tears out three leaves of her husband's book of wicked wives and he retaliates by hitting her so hard that he fears he may have killed her. The outcome here is as unexpected as that in WBT. The husband repents of his attack, gives the Wife back all her wealth, and agrees that she shall have absolute sovereignty in the marriage. Far from exploiting this situation, the Wife of Bath exercises this sovereignty to their mutual benefit. She no longer puts her own interests and pleasures first. From that moment she becomes a model wife who pursues common, instead of personal, aims in marriage. She has undergone a complete *volte face* which is no less amazing than the

transformation of the old hag into a beautiful woman. The theme is again that of the ideal marriage. By courtly love traditions a man should surrender everything to his beloved and become her creature. This is what Jankin does, what the knight in WBT did, and what Arveragus in FkT had done. By the same token a woman should not abuse the power entrusted to her: she should employ it to the glory and honour of her husband.

The message of WBP is the same as that of WBT: an abuse of power, marital tyranny on the part of the Wife of Bath and exploitation of the poor on the part of the knight, is checked by some other power so that the abuse is neutralised and then converted into a form of social harmony. Though both have a similar message, the prologue is so much more colourful that its resolution of disharmony in marriage might suggest that the principal theme in both WBP and WBT is that of harmony in marriage. This harmony in WBP is to be understood as a symbol for a greater social harmony, for we understand that vice of whatever kind can be corrected and abated so that there is a restoration of that equality and harmony which the vice disrupted. There are naturally subsidiary themes such as the conflict between youth and age, between poverty and wealth, between nobility and virtue, and between experience and authority. They support the main theme because in them each attribute claims to be better than its opposite, though in the tale true harmony can only be realised when each recognises the demands and interests of the other.

It may be appreciated from the foregoing that WBP and WBT form a single unit and so there is no need to assume that parts of WBP were composed at different stages. If WBPT is understood in the way I have outlined it follows it was written after the description of the Wife of Bath in Pro and there are no grounds for thinking that that description was modified after WBPT was written. If it is accepted that Pro was written before most or all of the tales that follow in the poem, there is nothing in the development of the Wife of Bath which would militate against that view. In Pro Chaucer used estates literature as a model for a description of a jolly, extrovert woman interested in sex. In WBPT he was more concerned with the theme of tyranny and so converted the Wife into a tyrant. In this process many features of the Wife in Pro were abandoned or adapted. The inappropriateness of some of those features and the difficulty Chaucer had in using them in their new environment are sufficient proof for the later composition of WBP. Although both WBP and WBT end in harmony, what we remember from each is the picture of the Wife of Bath as a tyrant rather than as a submissive partner and the picture of the old hag lecturing her husband rather than the beautiful girl. For it is the tyrant and the hag who have the largest roles in their stories and who are the most colourful. Hence it is hardly surprising that Chaucer should have come to think of the Wife particularly in her guise as the tyrannical woman for this is her most memorable aspect. It is hardly surprising that later scribes who were equally impressed by the colourful nature and forcefulness of this character should have augmented the description by adding further passages to WBP. It is not possible to tell whether these additions were made by one or by several

scribes.

One final point needs elucidation. WBPT is usually regarded as part of the Marriage Group, though as we have seen that grouping has recently been called into question. WBPT was grouped with FrT and SuT by Chaucer, and that is the only association he is known to have provided for it. If WBPT is concerned with tyranny, one might expect the other two tales to have some reference to that theme. This is indeed so but there are important differences: in the latter two tales the tyranny is not sexual and there is no resolution into harmony. In FrT we see the tyranny exercised by a summoner over the poor, particularly over a widow. The widow tries to resist him and wishes him to the devil. The devil who is accompanying the summoner asks her to confirm this gift, which she does if the summoner refuses to repent. He is adamant in his refusal; so he is taken off to hell. In this tale the tyranny is pecuniary exploitation. The tyrant is given an opportunity to repent, but refuses. His refusal leads to his destruction. This refusal contrasts with the willingness to abandon a former way of life as exemplified in WBP and WBT.

The summoner in FrT is matched by the friar in SuT, for he is equally rapacious and exploits the laity for gain. One of those who had given generously in the past is so angry with the friar and his behaviour that he plays the practical joke of the fart on him. The friar in anger goes to the neighbouring lord for help against this insult, threatening to abuse his office as friar to slander and attack him. Instead of exercising charity and restraint as urged by the lord, the friar exhibits only anger and spite. The court does not take the friar's complaint too seriously and the lord's squire makes a proposal which humiliates the friar even further. He is ridiculed by all. The friar's refusal to accept a rebuke leads to his further humiliation.

It may be accepted, therefore, that this section of the *Canterbury Tales* consists of four episodes, i.e. WBP, WBT, FrT and SuT, in each of which one character tyrannises others. However, in the first two this behaviour when checked is abandoned so that harmony within the social framework is restored. In the latter two any check leads not to repentance but to a desire for revenge and excessive anger. The result is total humiliation as the perpetrators are removed from the scene of their previous activities. They have no place in the harmony of the social fabric. In this way the four episodes may be said to form a cohesive group. It was because of the needs of this theme that the character of the wife in Pro was changed to the tyrannous woman in WBP and it was as the tyrannous woman that she developed into that symbol which caught the imagination of its creator as well as of so many other readers. The Wife of Bath does exhibit a development, but it is not the one which previous scholars have presented to us.

NOTES

[1] R.A. Pratt, "The Development of the Wife of Bath", in *Studies in Medieval Literature in Honor of A.C. Baugh*, ed. MacEdward Leach (Philadelphia, 1961) p.45.

[2] *op.cit.* pp.46-7.

[3] W.W. Skeat, *The Evolution of the Canterbury Tales*, Chaucer Society 2nd ser. 38 (London, 1907).

[4] J.M. Manly and E. Rickert, *The Text of the Canterbury Tales*, 8 vols. (Chicago, 1940); see particularly vols. 1 and 2 *passim*.

[5] E.T. Donaldson, *Chaucer's Poetry* (2nd ed., New York, 1975) and N.F. Blake, *The Canterbury Tales by Geoffrey Chaucer* (London, 1980). For the use of Hg by the Variorum editors see D.C. Baker, "The Relation of the Hengwrt Manuscript to the Variorum Chaucer Text", *The Canterbury Tales: Geoffrey Chaucer: A Facsimile and Transcription of the Hengwrt Manuscript*, ed. P.G. Ruggiers (Norman, Oklahoma, and Folkstone, 1979) pp.xvii-xviii. The Hengwrt manuscript is quoted from Blake's edition (1980) and the sectional lineation used in it is also used here. The Ellesmere manuscript is quoted from J.H. Fisher, *The Complete Poetry and Prose of Geoffrey Chaucer* (New York, 1977) where the traditional Group/Fragment lineation is used. Unless otherwise stated all references in the poem use the lineation in my edition. The tale titles have been abbreviated according to the system in Manly-Rickert (1940) and Blake (1980).

[6] See particularly her "A Chapter in the Manuscript History of the *Canterbury Tales*", *PMLA* 63 (1948) pp.456-84, and "The Fifteenth-Century Editors of the *Canterbury Tales* and the Problem of Tale Order", *PMLA* 64 (1949) pp.1123-42.

[7] A.I. Doyle and M.B. Parkes, "The Production of Copies of the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Confessio Amantis* in the Early Fifteenth Century", in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts & Libraries: Essays Presented to N.R. Ker*, ed. M.B. Parkes and A.G. Watson (London, 1978) pp.163-210.

[8] N.F. Blake, "The Relationship between the Hengwrt and the Ellesmere Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*", *Essays and Studies* n.s. 32 (1979) pp.1-18.

[9] The tales in question are SqT, FkT, MeT and NuT; see further Blake, *Essays and Studies* n.s. 32 and *Canterbury Tales* (1980).

[10] M. Stevens, "The Royal Stanza in Early English Literature", *PMLA* 94 (1979) pp.62-76.

[11] This matter is discussed further in my "Chaucer's Text and the Web of Words", a paper delivered to the Second International Chaucer Congress (New Orleans, April 1980) and to be published in the Proceedings.

[12] *A Facsimile and Transcription of the Hengwrt Manuscript*, p.xxviii.

[13] R.F. Jones, "A Conjecture on the Wife of Bath's Prologue", *JEGP* 24 (1925) pp.512-47.

[14] *The Envoy to Bukton* is accepted as Chaucerian because of the ascription to Chaucer in Fairfax 16, one of two manuscripts in which the poem is found, and because of the reference to the Wife of Bath in it. These reasons are hardly conclusive, but it seems best to accept the traditional ascription.

[15] See E.P. Hammond, *Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual* (London, 1908) pp.296-7, and Pratt *op.cit.* p.59.

[16] Using the Manly-Rickert system of abbreviations, all the extra lines in WBP are found in manuscripts of groups *a* and *b*, and in Ch, Ii, Ry^1 and Se. Some of the extra passages are found in El, Gg, Ad^3, Ha^2 and Ld^1, though there is no consistency in their appearance in these manuscripts.

[17] J. Mann, *Chaucer and Medieval Estates Satire* (Cambridge, 1973).

[18] See also A.K. Moore, "The Pardoner's Interruption of the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*", *Modern Language Quarterly* 10 (1949) pp.49-57.

STREAMS AND SWAMPS IN THE *GAWAIN* COUNTRY

By RALPH W.V. ELLIOTT

In this and other essays[1] devoted to an examination of the topographical vocabulary of Middle English alliterative poetry I have used "The *Gawain* country" as a convenient shorthand both for the countryside of the north-west midlands and northern England in which most of this poetry was composed, and for the fictional landscapes within the poems themselves. The latter range from purely imaginary settings, some of them, as in *The Wars of Alexander*, far removed from England, to tracts of west midland or northern scenery made recognizable by the mention of place-names, as in *The Awntyrs off Arthure at the Terne Wathelyn* or *Piers Plowman*, or by the description of local landmarks as in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.[2] Such an inclusive shorthand is possible because the fictional landscapes appear to be not infrequently based on the genuine English countryside with which the poets were familiar and which, whenever it is apposite to do so, I call the "real" *Gawain* country. The principal criteria of this resemblance are the links between the topographical vocabulary employed by the alliterative poets and local toponymy, and the use made of this vocabulary in creating fictional settings based on real landscapes. Such, it has been suggested, for example, is the case with that "typical view of the West Country" in *Mum and the Sothsegger* 885ff.,[3] and even more probably with several of the episodes in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.[4]

Taken in conjunction with other groups of words, those denoting hills, valleys, woods, forests, and scrubland, the evidence of the "water"-words here discussed suggests strongly that the alliterative poets at times drew upon their local map, as it were, when describing landscapes and for words to describe them. The vocabulary itself is in any case of sufficient interest to deserve more attention than it has received hitherto, and the particular qualities of certain landscape descriptions in alliterative poems most frequently commented upon - their effectiveness and their "realism" - may well derive from the poets' familiarity with and response to local landscapes, and their knowledge and use of dialect words endowed with local associations.

Most of the alliterative poems tell of adventures, whether of questing knights or warring kings, or of spiritual pilgrimages as in *Piers Plowman* or *Pearl*, which take place in hilly or mountainous regions where rivers run and forests abound or where, as in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, large tracts of countryside are mires and marshland. Hence words denoting the open sea are less

common, and the interesting fact emerges that poets often used "inland" "water"-words like northern *borne* or the widely current *broke* or the more specific *dam* to describe the sea. All three of these words are thus used by the *Gawain*-poet. The requirements of alliteration to some extent explain such usages, but as some of the poets probably knew little of the ocean, yet knew a great deal about mountain torrents and inland rivers, it is understandable that they should have recourse to such familiar words. Langland was such a one: his "water"-words are few and commonplace and the only large expanse of water with which he evinces any familiarity at all is Noah's Flood.

ee, flum, gufere, rake

The range of words denoting streams of all kinds in alliterative poetry is considerable. There are, on the one hand, the more common words known all over England, like *broke* "brook", *reuer* "river", and *strem* "stream". Similarly, there are common words denoting an expanse of water, like *lake* or *pole* "pool, pond", or the more "technical" *dam* "a stretch of water confined by a dam", or *water* itself, the latter freely used to describe any watery feature. The Old English word *ēa* "river, stream", although common in place-names throughout the country, is rare in literature. It occurs, for example, in *The Wars of Alexander* 5464:

> þan entirs in of his erles & ouire þe ee passis,

where it appears to be used for alliteration. The word survives in several dialects including the East Cheshire dialect of Mr Colin Garner, a septuagenarian craftsman who has lived all his life, as have his forbears, at Alderley Edge, and who responded to *ee* with "a stretch of water; I've heard of it".[5]

At the other extreme are the rare words *flum*, *gufere*, and *rake*. Of these the first, *flum*, occurs five times in *The Wars of Alexander* and once, in the phrase "flom jordane", the "River Jordan", in *The Quatrefoil of Love* 173.[6] Derived from Old French *flum*, ultimately from Latin *flumen*, the Middle English word means "river, stream". Although the word does not appear as an element in place-names and is rare in alliterative poetry, it is found occasionally in other thirteenth- and fourteenth-century writings and was eventually transposed with several specialised meanings into the English of the United States and New Zealand. Whether it is connected with the south-midland dialect word *flam* "a low marshy place near a river", which the *English Dialect Dictionary* records in Oxfordshire and some neighbouring counties, must remain conjectural.

In *Patience* 310 occurs the stirring line

> Alle þe gote3 of þy guferes and groundele3 powle3,[7]

which provides the only instance of *gufere* cited by the *Middle English Dictionary*. The word is probably a variant of *golf* "a

deep cavity, abyss", which appears in the similar phrase "goteȝ of golf" in *Pearl* 608.[8] In Old French, too, *goufre* is cited as a variant of *golfe*.[9] There are a few occurrences of *golf* outside the alliterative poems, but the topographical senses of "a gulf, bay, or whirlpool" were not common. Neither form is listed in A.H. Smith's *English Place-Name Elements*.[10] There is, however, the interesting link with the northern dialectal *goave* or *goaf*, first discussed by E.V. Gordon and C.T. Onions in connection with the passage in *Pearl*,[11] which, as the *English Dialect Dictionary* records, denotes "the space left in a coal-mine after the whole of the coal has been extracted" in various parts of the north country northwards from Lancashire, as well as "a hollow or depression in the moorland or on a hillside" in west Yorkshire. The *Gawain*-poet's "goteȝ of guferes" in *Patience* and the unceasing "goteȝ of golf" in *Pearl* may well recall the deep river cavities in the Pennine limestone country, as Gordon and Onions suggest, with which the poet was very likely familiar. To this day, some of the rivers in the Peak district disappear underground for considerable stretches, to re-appear as "goteȝ of guferes", rushing currents of water, out of the depths. The river Manifold, for example, in north-eastern Staffordshire, disappears beneath Darfur Crags, to surge forth again in the grounds of Ilam Hall, some 8 km downstream. One of its tributaries, the Hamps, similarly runs underground for part of its course. It appears that we have here a local phenomenon which provided both the image and a rare topographical word for the *Gawain*-poet.

The third of the rare words listed earlier, *rake*, goes back to Old English *racu* "course, path". As the meaning "path" is well attested in various dialects, in place-names, and occasionally in literature, the word is usually given this sense by editors of alliterative poems. It is thus glossed for its two occurrences in *Morte Arthure* 1525, 2985,[12] and two in *The Wars of Alexander* 3383, 5070. Elsewhere in alliterative poetry the word occurs only twice within fifteen lines in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (2144, 2160) where it describes the steep downward descent into the valley of the Green Chapel. When the knight reaches the bottom reference is made to "þe brymme", *the* stream, although none has been mentioned before, unless indeed we take *rake* here to mean "watercourse, stream", a sense confirmed by Old English usage where the compounds *ēa-racu* and *strēam-racu* point to such semantic development. This is further borne out by the meaning "reach, the straight stretch of a river", found in place-names (AHS II, 78), and it is perhaps worth recording that for Mr Colin Garner, my Cheshire informant, *rake* has a sufficiently similar meaning to elicit the response: "You get it on farms, same as Burgess's rake. I'd got it in my mind it froze over." It is not merely semantically possible but contextually probable that *rake* in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* represents another uncommon word for "stream".

bekke, borne

The remaining words which denote "a river, stream" in alliterative poetry, can be associated even more firmly with midland and

northern dialects than the two just discussed. A notable exception is *bekke*, from Old Norse *bekkr*, which, according to A.H. Smith (I, 26), replaced Old English *brōc* "brook" and *burna* "burn" in much of the north country and the Danelaw, but which does not figure in alliterative poetry, where *borne* continues to be used. On the other hand, in the north country, as Smith also notes (I, 63) the introduction of Old Norse *brunnr* reinforced the use of Old English *burna*, so that the continuing use of *borne* in alliterative poetry, as well as in non-alliterative poems, is not surprising. The *Gawain*-poet uses the word in all four poems, to denote streams in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and *Pearl*, and the sea and the Flood respectively in *Patience* and *Cleanness*.[13] The word occurs several times in both *The Destruction of Troy*[14] and *The Wars of Alexander*. It is recorded, for example, from fourteenth-century Worcestershire, where Langland also knew it, in the personal name "Joh. atte Bourn",[15] and is found in such north-west midland place-names as Ashbourne in Derbyshire.

gille, gole

The northern and north-midland *gille* occurs northwards from Derbyshire and Lancashire with the sense of "a deep and narrow valley, a ravine," usually with wooded banks and a stream running at the bottom. The word connoted the presence of a stream in Old Norse and the connotation appears to have survived in Middle English, patently so when re-inforced by "stream" in the compound *gill-stremes* found in *The Wars of Alexander*, where the Ashmole manuscript reads at line 3231

Girdid out as gutars in grete gill-stremes,

a better reading than the *gylle-stormez* of the Dublin manuscript. In *The Awntyrs off Arthure* the word *gylles* is used once (418) as a convenient rhyme word in the not particularly informative phrase "greues and gylles", and it also occurs occasionally in non-alliterative works.

The word *gole*, still known in north-east Cheshire with the meaning "ditch" and found in neighbouring Derbyshire in the place-name Watergo (cp. the sixteenth-century form Watergawle), south-west of Derby, is probably of native origin, although possibly influenced in form by the Old French *goule* "throat" from which the *Middle English Dictionary* derives it. The meaning of "watercourse", more specifically "a ditch, channel, stream" is well attested in place-names and dialect in the north, in several midland counties, and in the south-west of England, and in its nonce occurrence in *Morte Arthure* 3725 the same meaning is appropriate.

gote, goter

Not far from Three Shire Heads, at the heart of the "real" *Gawain* country, where the counties of Cheshire, Staffordshire, and Derbyshire meet, are the headwaters of the river Goyt which eventually joins with the Etherow to form the river Mersey. Although some early forms of the name suggest a Celtic origin,

others point to an Old English *gota*, related to the verb *gēotan* "to pour, flow", as the origin of the river-name as well as of Middle English *gote*. This word occurs in *Cleanness* 413 and *The Wars of Alexander* 4796 with the meaning "a watercourse, a stream", as well as in the phrases "goteȝ of . . . guferes" and "goteȝ of golf" in *Patience* and *Pearl* which we noted earlier. The word is known to my Cheshire informant and is recorded in several north-country, midland, and south-western dialects by the *English Dialect Dictionary*. Although not confined to the "real" *Gawain* country of the north-west midlands, it formed part of its dialect, and indeed still does, and also figures there in such minor names as Lightgote in Derbyshire.[16] Its occurrence in several alliterative poems, particularly those of the *Gawain*-poet, may thus be regarded as reflecting regional usage.

Even more common in the local toponymy of the "real" *Gawain* country is the dialectal "gutter" which denotes both "a drain, channel, narrow watercourse" and "a small stream" and is known as such to my Cheshire informant. Of Old French origin, probably via Anglo-Norman *gotere* and possibly influenced by Middle English *gote*, the word *goter* is represented in such minor names as Tinkerspit Gutter, head-water of the Cheshire river Dane, in the parish of Wildboarclough,[17] in such Staffordshire moorland names as Green Gutter Head and Lower Stoke Gutter on Goldsitch Moss, and in the simple name Gutter in Hartington Upper Quarter parish near Buxton in north-west Derbyshire. The word is used by several alliterative poets and occasionally elsewhere. In *The Siege of Jerusalem* it occurs alongside the distinctive midland word *baches* "valleys" in a couplet redolent of reminiscences of gushing streams:

> Baches woxen ablode a-boute in þe vale,
> & goutes fram gold wede as goteres þey runne.
> (*Siege Jer* 559-60)[18]

In Book V (1607) of *The Destruction of Troy*, the river Xanthus is described as running under the city "through Godardys & other grete vautes", where *godardys* is a variant of *goteres* and denotes water channels used, *inter alia*, to turn mill wheels. The form in *The Wars of Alexander* is *gutars* in 3231, and *guttars* in 4796 where it is linked with *gotis*, which we discussed above. In the latter instance the meaning is practically that of the modern English "gutter", whereas in line 3231 it means "streams" or even "torrents". Despite its appearance in such exotic narrative surroundings, the word *goter* provides yet another example of a topographical word with which several of the alliterative poets were familiar from local usage.

rasse, res(se)

Old Norse *rás* "a rush of water, a water-channel" survives in Middle English as well as in modern English "mill race", perhaps reinforced by French *ras, raz* "strong current", and is more likely to be the root of the word *rasse* in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* 1570 than Old French *ras* "level (ground)" which causes most editors

and translators to render the word as "bank or ledge" in the poem, a meaning more appropriate in *Cleanness* 446. The "hole" to which the boar retreats in this episode of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is not a cave in the hillside, but an opening up or widening of the water-course in which the "boerne" runs among steep banks, and in which the hunted animal scrapes desperately before succumbing to Sir Bertilak in mid-stream. The word occurs in late minor names according to A.H. Smith (II, 81), as in the Yorkshire Gipsey Race.

Cognate with Old Norse *rás* is Old English *rǣs* "race, rush, onslaught" which occurs as *res(se)* in several alliterative poems. In *Pearl* 874 the word is used to reinforce the image of rushing waters,

> Lyk flodeȝ fele laden runnen on resse,

which A.C. Cawley renders "like many rivers rushing in full spate",[19] and which evokes a picture very similar to the poet's description in the boar hunt in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Usage in the alliterative poems suggests that the several related meanings of Old Norse *râs*, Old English *rǣs*, and Old French *ras* (which is also glossed "*fossé plein d'eau*") tended to conflate in Middle English. Thus, for example, in *The Wars of Alexander* 1996 the phrase "redis in a rese" means "reads in a hurry", but the word may well have suggested itself to the poet by the reference to "þe streme of struma" in the preceding line.

rynel, stanc

Confronted with the word "runnel" my Cheshire informant offered this response: "I know 'rundle'. That's water going under a road, same as a splash or a ford covered over." The earlier forms, without intrusive *d*, derive from the Old English pair *rynel* (masculine) and *rynele* or *rinnelle* (feminine). Later English has the several forms "runnel", "rundle", and "rindle", all meaning "a small stream, rivulet". The *English Dialect Dictionary* assigns both "runnel" and "rindle" to the midlands and north country, including Staffordshire and neighbouring counties, while D. Wilson narrows the Staffordshire usage of "rindle" even further, to the moorlands.[20]

Among the poets of the alliterative revival only the poet of *The Destruction of Troy* appears to use the word *rynel*, and he associates it, perhaps mainly for reasons of alliteration, with "red" blood. In line 5709 the word has its literal meaning of "a small stream", here used to denote the rivulets running with the blood of the wounded and slain in the battle following the landing of the Greeks in Book XIV:

> The rynels wex red of the ronke blode.

The same picture is transformed into the image of "Rinels of red blode" running down Hector's cheeks in the other occurrence of the word, in Book XVII, 7506. Both the literal and the figurative usage confirm familiarity with a word associated mainly with the north and the north midlands.

The same poet employs another "water"-word of limited literary occurrence, *stanc* "a pond, pool", from Old French *estanc*, to describe the pool into which the Greeks cast the body of Penthesilea in Book XXVIII. The reference to a pond or reservoir,

> A stanke full of stynke standyng besyde,
> (*Destr Troy* 11189)

at first sight seems to conflict with the description of it as "a clere terne" two lines earlier, but *clere* here means "calm, unruffled", perhaps even "torpid". Chaucer uses *clere* similarly to render Latin *serenus* in describing the sea in *Boece* II, metrum 3, 13. The inconsistency is rather in equating *stanke* and *terne*, both meaning "pond" or "pool" with *burne* in 11472, which denotes flowing water. But the latter reference is at some remove from the earlier ones and *burne* appears to have been chosen for alliteration at the expense of topographical consistency.

The *Gawain*-poet uses *stanc* twice in *Cleanness*, in one instance opting for the same association of the word with "stink" as in *The Destruction of Troy*, which might suggest not merely an alliterative convenience or a false etymological linking but an actual awareness of the odour emanating from stagnant pools:

> As a stynkande stanc þat stryed synne.
> (*Cleanness* 1018)

Towards the end of the description of the Flood earlier in the poem God is shown turning off the waters:

> Þen he stac vp þe stangeȝ, stoped þe welleȝ,
> (*Cleanness* 439)

which in view of the Latin *cataractae coeli* of *Genesis* viii, 2, Anderson glosses "floodgates, cataracts". These are proper renderings of the Latin word, but they have different meanings in English. In the present instance, the sense of "waterfall" is inappropriate, as the word *stangeȝ* connotes "reservoirs" which are here blocked or dammed up to stop the flow of water, a sense more in accord with the word's usual meaning of "pond, pool". The latter is confirmed by three occurrences in *The Wars of Alexander* as well as by place-names in Herefordshire, Lancashire, and north Yorkshire (AHS II, 146). In dialect the word had wider currency, and it is found in Middle English writings other than alliterative poetry. Chaucer uses it once, to describe the lake in hell into which, according to *Revelation* xxi, 8, adulterers will be cast: "Seint John seith that avowtiers shullen been in helle, in a stank brennynge of fyr and of brymston" (*The Parson's Tale* 840).[21] In Cheshire, although the corresponding verb is listed in the phrase "stanking a drain", that is damming it up, in Egerton Leigh's *Glossary*,[22] the word has not survived into the dialect of my informant from Alderley Edge.

strynde, terne

In the valley of the Cheshire-Derbyshire river Goyt, which was mentioned earlier, the place-name Strines in High Peak hundred reveals in its earlier forms Stryndes, Strindes the Middle English *strynde* used by the *Gawain*-poet in *Patience* 311:

And þy stryuande streme3 of strynde3 so mony.

The word is of uncertain, but probably Old English, origin, and may be related to *strand*. Its meaning ranges from "a ditch, water-channel" to "stream" and in *Patience* it is best rendered "currents". Although not confined to alliterative poetry it seems largely western and northern in Middle English. The word is also recorded in some minor names in Derbyshire, and the *English Dialect Dictionary* cites examples of usage from Lincolnshire, Shropshire, and Yorkshire, thus confirming it as yet another word with strong regional colouring.

The same is true of the word *terne*, derived from Old Norse *tjǫrn* "a tarn, small lake, pool", which belongs in toponymy and dialect wholly to the north-west, and which in Middle English generally as well as in alliterative poetry is similarly restricted. The poet of *The Destruction of Troy*, as we noted earlier, equates the word with *stanke*, and so does the poet of *The Wars of Alexander* whose *staunke* is also called a *terne* (3860). *The Awntyrs off Arthure*, as the full title indicates, takes place "at the Terne Wathelyn", Tarn Wadling, a small lake south of Carlisle, drained in the nineteenth century, which is also the setting for three other surviving romances.[23] The *Gawain*-poet uses the word but once, perhaps for alliteration, in *Cleanness* 1041:

And þer ar tres by þat terne of traytoures,

thereby illustrating yet again his familiarity with a topographical term associated with the north-west of the country.

see, occiane, fome, bre

There is a small group of words used by alliterative poets which denote inland lakes or ponds, occasionally streams, but which are used on occasions to refer to the sea. Some "sea"-words in Middle English, developed straight from Old English or Old Norse, were common and familiar, like *see* "sea" itself. But a word like *occiane* "ocean" was still sufficiently uncommon and learned a word for Chaucer to restrict it to his "wise" Man of Law, apart from its being used once in his *Boece*. It is equally uncommon in alliterative poetry, where it occurs in *The Wars of Alexander* 2328, 5503, in *Morte Arthure* 31, and in *Alexander and Dindimus* 533.[24] The poet of *The Destruction of Troy* uses the word twice as an adjective in the phrase "the se occiane" (4440, 13254).

The same poet uses *fome* "foam", from Old English *fām*, several times for "sea", as does the poet of *Alexander and Dindimus* who twice alliterates it with "fish". This use of "foam", also attested in non-alliterative Middle English, is familiar from its later

appearance in the line "To Norroway o'er the faem" in the ballad *Sir Patrick Spens*.

Rather more idiosyncratic is the word *bre*, which normally denotes various liquids, such as "broth, soup, juice" and even a kind of ale, but which appears twice in *The Destruction of Troy* meaning "sea" (3697, 12516). Mr Colin Garner's response to "brew" was "slang for brook". The word, at least in its topographical sense, looks like an inland dialect word used by the poet of *The Destruction of Troy* as a synonym for "sea" for purposes of alliteration.

flode, brymme, laye

The ubiquitous word *flode* "flood" (like *water*) could describe anything from a stream to the ocean, a semantic range inherited from Old English *flōd*, and well illustrated by the various uses to which the *Gawain*-poet puts the word in his four poems. Similarly, the Old English poetic word *brim* has several uses in Middle English. Originally either "sea, flood, water" or "the edge of the sea, shore", Middle English *brymme* can denote any body of water, from a spring to the sea. The alliterative poets used it as a rule more specifically to mean either "stream", as in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* 2172 and *The Wars of Alexander* 4080, or "bank, brink", as in *Cleanness* 365 and *Pearl* 232, 1074.

An interesting development is that of Old English *lagu* "water" which generally referred to the sea in Old English poetry. Its Middle English descendant *laye* has the more restricted meaning "lake, pond". Yet in the alliterative *Morte Arthure*, where Arthur with his ships "lengede one laye" (3721), the word again means "sea". According to A.H. Smith (II, 12), the element appears in the Devon place-name Slapton Ley, a large lake, and in East Anglia, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the word was recorded in the nineteenth century with the meaning of "a very large pond". Closer to the "real" *Gawain* country of the north-west midlands is the still current sense of "a stretch of water, not running" in the East Cheshire dialect of Mr Colin Garner.

abyme, hourle, loghe

The latter responded unhesitatingly with "Yes; deep water" to the word *abyme* "abyss, depths (of sea or earth)", which is not common in the sense "sea" in alliterative poetry. In the description of the Flood in *Cleanness* 363, it may have been suggested by the Latin use of *abyssus* in the Vulgate (*Genesis* vii, 11), as Anderson surmises in his edition. That the word could specifically mean "sea" to the poet is clear from *Patience* 318, where it is preceded by the phrase "I am wrapped in water" in the previous line and followed by the line

> Þe pure poplande hourle playes on my heued,
> (*Pat* 319)

which uses another rare "water"-word, *hourle*. Jonah is crying to

God from the depths of the sea, and the whole passage rings with evocative "sea"-words.

The word *hourle* probably derives from the verb *hurlen* "to rush" which was commonly associated with surging water. The above line from *Patience* is repeated almost *verbatim* in the Ashmole manuscript of *The Wars of Alexander* 1154,

Þe pure populande hurle passis it vmby,

where *hurle* denotes the surge of the sea. In the Dublin manuscript of *The Wars of Alexander* another verbal derivative of similar meaning, *perle*, expresses the same idea of a rush or surge of water.

Finally, it is worth noting that the *Gawain*-poet's *loghe* appears to have been yet another inland "water"-word, which here provides a useful alliterative synonym for "sea" both in *Patience* 230 and in its three occurrences in *Cleanness*. Of Celtic origin, the northern Old English *luh*, meaning "loch, lake, pond", is found in its Middle English form in this sense in *The Wars of Alexander* 3899 and *The Awntyrs off Arthure* 83, and in some non-alliterative works. Although in place-names this element occurs mainly in the north, it is found as far south as Lincolnshire and may be present in the Derbyshire place-name Loughborne.[25]

flosche, plasche

The topographical affinity of a stretch of water, like a pond or lake, with marshland, that is a tract of land more or less permanently waterlogged, is well illustrated by the Middle English word *flosche*. In place-names, *flosche* (also *flasche*) can mean "a pool" as well as "a swamp", testimony perhaps to the difficulty of differentiating between the two in a rainy climate before the days of adequate drainage. The more northerly form *flask* reveals the Scandinavian origin of the word, from Old Danish *flask*, "a swamp, a pool", while the Old French *flache* "small pool, puddle" may have helped to develop the forms in *s(c)h*, which range from the north country to the midlands.

In alliterative poetry two of the poets use *flosche* to demarcate one side of a narrow passage or restricted terrain, as swamps were obviously considered treacherous, if not impassable. Thus the *Gawain*-poet's

Bitwene a flosche in þat fryth and a foo cragge,
(*Gaw* 1430)

where the passage is between a swamp and a forbidding crag, whereas in *Morte Arthure* the other side is a stretch of water proper, "a flode":

Be-twyx a plasche and a flode, appone a flate lawnde.
(*Morte Arth* 2798)

Alliteration confirms that the word here must originally have been

flasche, although another topographical word *plasche* also exists. The latter, which is paralleled in Middle Dutch *plasch*, is probably onomatopoeic in origin. It means "a marshy pool" and occurs in place-names and some personal names of the south and the west midlands.[26] I have found no examples of *plasche* in alliterative poetry, apart from the doubtful occurrence in *Morte Arthure*. The *Promptorium Parvulorum* equates the two words: "Plasch, or flasch qwere rayne water stondyth . . ."[27]

In both *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and *Morte Arthure* the meaning "swamp, marsh" is appropriate for *flosche*, whereas in *The Wars of Alexander* 2049 the word denotes "pools of blood" in which the horses are wading to their fetlocks:

> Þat foles ferd in þe flosches to þe fetelakis.

A similar image is created in the description of the massacre in *The Siege of Jerusalem* which, as we noted earlier, makes use of several interesting "water"-words. Here the reference is also to horses wading, this time knee-deep, but *flasches* may be more literally puddles or small pools of water into which runs the blood of men and beasts:

> Þe blode fomed hem fro in þe flasches aboute,
> Þat kne-depe in þe dale dascheden stedes.
> (*Siege Jer* 571-2)

The *Gawain*-poet's use of a topographical word almost entirely restricted in Middle English literature to these few occurrences is of particular interest in a passage in which several other rare words are employed to describe the terrain of the boar hunt. I have suggested elsewhere[28] that these words may have found their way into *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* from an actual landscape in the southern Pennines where they occur close together in local place-names. Here it suffices to note that one of these words is represented in the name Flash, a village in the north-east corner of Staffordshire, in a marshy moorland setting with appropriate echoes of medieval boar hunts.

ker(re), misy

The *Gawain*-poet uses two other words in this poem to denote swamps which occur nowhere else in alliterative poetry and rarely elsewhere. These are *ker(re)* and *misy*. The first, of Scandinavian origin as in Old Icelandic *kjarr* "brushwood", is common in place-names of the Danelaw (AHS II, 4). The word is still familiar to my Cheshire informant, and it occurs quite frequently in place-names and minor names in north-east Cheshire, North Staffordshire, and north-west Derbyshire, the heartland of the "real" *Gawain* country. There is, for example, the "sow's marsh", Sowcar, in Rainow parish in Macclesfield hundred in Cheshire, or Broad Carr in High Peak hundred, Derbyshire, recorded as "le Soweker" in 1379 and "Brodeker" in 1285 respectively. The *Gawain*-poet's "in a ker syde" (1421) and "at þe kerre syde" (1431) occur close together in the description of the boar hunt and clearly envisage the hunters skirting the

marshland. It is worth noting that this is the same passage in which the word *flosche* occurs (1430).

The word *misy* occurs only once in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*:

> Þurȝ mony misy and myre, mon al hym one,
> (*Gaw* 749)

as Sir Gawain rides on his way to keep his tryst. *The Middle English Dictionary* cites no other example, and the word is not listed as a place-name element by A.H. Smith. Probably related to Old English *mēos* "moss" and *mos* "a moss, marsh", *misy* is recorded as *mizzy* in Dr Johnson's *Dictionary* with the meaning "a bog, quagmire", and is cited as a north country and a Lancashire dialect word by the *English Dialect Dictonary*. Egerton Leigh lists the variant "mizzick", meaning "bog", in his Cheshire *Glossary*, but the word is not known to my informant from Alderley Edge. The nearest place-name forms to *misy* are those incorporating Old English *mēos*, like Meese in Staffordshire and Shropshire, and the names of two midland rivers: the Mease, which rises in Leicestershire and joins the Trent near Alrewas in Staffordshire, and the Meese, which flows from western Staffordshire into Shropshire.[29] The *Gawain*-poet's *misy* is certainly an uncommon word with strong regional colouring.

myre, mosse, marasse

The word *myre* which the poet links with *misy* is, on the other hand, quite common. Used by the poet also in *Patience* 279 and *Cleanness* 1114, the word occurs in other alliterative poems and elsewhere in Middle English literature. Derived from Old Norse *mýrr* "a mire, bog", the word occurs in place-names mainly in areas of Scandinavian settlement. In Great Longstone parish in the High Peak hundred of Derbyshire, for instance, the minor name The Mires is recorded as "le myre" in a mid-fourteenth-century personal name.

Old Norse *mýrr*, Old English *mēos*, and Old English *mos* are etymologically related. From *mos* derives Middle English *mosse* which can mean "bog, swamp", as well as "moss". Both senses are found in place-names, mainly of the north country and the north-west midlands (AHS II, 43), where it is a common element in the moorlands of the southern Pennines. The word is linked contextually with "misy and myre" in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, occurring a few lines earlier:

> With roȝe raged mosse rayled aywhere.
> (*Gaw* 745)

It means "moss" here, but carries connotations of marshy ground, as mosses thrive in moist soil. This connection is exploited even more closely in *Morte Arthure* where the word is twice used in the alliterative phrase "the mosse and the marrasse" (2014) and "thorowe marasse and mosse" (2505), where connotations of marshy terrain are further conveyed by *marasse* "morass, swamp", from Old French *mareis*, found elsewhere in Middle English and in several other alliterative

poems, including *Piers Plowman*, but not used by the *Gawain*-poet. Langland uses *mosse* in the description of St Paul the hermit invisible in his concealment "for mosse and for leues" (*Piers Plowman* B XV, 287) where the botanical sense is patent, and the same connotations of concealment are present in line 93 of *The Parlement of the Thre Ages* where a compound "hair-moss" is used:

With hethe and with horemosse hilde it about.[30]

With its connotations of concealment, of mosses growing in moist ground as well as in the cracks of stones and rocks, as in *Mum and the Sothsegger* 1643-5, and of bogs and marshland generally, *mosse* is one of the more versatile "swamp"-words found in alliterative poetry.

mor

In the north of England and, as A.H. Smith notes (II, 42), especially along the Pennines, the word *mor* (Old English *mōr*, Old Norse *mór*) generally denotes "a high tract of barren uncultivated ground", whereas in more low-lying parts as well as in other regions of England it may refer to "marshland". In the alliterative poems, *mor* is frequently made to alliterate with *mountez* as in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* 2080, *Cleanness* 385, *The Destruction of Troy* 7350, 7808, and *The Siege of Jerusalem* 726, while the poet of *William of Palerne* uses both *mor* and *mire* in the same formulaic manner, presumably giving to both the common meaning "marshland", unless indeed the distinction is purely scribal:

ouer mures & muntaynes & many faire pleynes,
(*Wm Pal* 2619)

ouer mires & muntaynes & oþer wicked weiȝes.
(*Wm Pal* 3507)[31]

In the phrase "by the more side" in *The Parlement of the Thre Ages* 495, the reference could be to the marshes then abundant in the vicinity of Glastonbury to which the passage refers. Löfvenberg (p.133ff.) cites *inter alia* the Somerset personal name "Edith de la Morland" from the thirteenth century, and similar surnames and place-names can be found in many other parts of England.

sloh, wose, warþe

Two words which among alliterative poets only Langland uses are *sloh*, Old English *slōh* "a slough, a mire" (*Piers Plowman* C XIII, 179),[32] which is found in place-names and minor names from Derbyshire southwards, as in the Derbyshire field-name "le Sloughes" from 1389; and *wose*, Old English *wāse* "mud" (*Piers Plowman* C XIII, 229), which occurs in place-names from Warwickshire southwards, and developed into modern English "ooze". The thirteenth-century Oxfordshire surname "Ric. de la Wose" contains this element.[33]

The word *warþe*, from Old English *waroð* "shore", used in alliterative poetry apparently only by the *Gawain*-poet in *Patience*

339 and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* 715, could be taken to mean "marshland" in the latter instance:

> At vche warþe oþer water þer þe wyȝe passed,
> (*Gaw* 715)

where a contrast with *water*, that is "stream", is presumably intended, so that the usual glosses "ford" or "river bank" lack conviction.[34] In *Patience* 339, on the other hand, the meaning "shore", attested in toponymy, is appropriate. As the meaning "marshy ground near a stream" appears to attach to some of the place-names containing this element (AHS II, 246), the *Gawain*-poet may well be using the word in the above line in this sense. He is, after all, enumerating the obstacles facing Sir Gawain as he rides through a wintry countryside which contains not only streams but the "mony misy and myre" already considered. In several inland dialects, the word *warth* denotes "a flat meadow, especially one close to a stream", with obvious swampy connotations, in the west midlands and West Yorkshire. In the north-west of Derbyshire the word occurs in a few late minor and field-names, like Warth Cottage in Chinley, Buxworth and Brownside parish, High Peak hundred. It is yet another example of a topographical term connoting marshy terrain used by the *Gawain*-poet that possesses some regional colouring.

*mershe, fen, bog, *wæsse*

Three other words merit brief notice. The word *mershe* "marsh" itself, from Old English *mersc*, has no specific regional associations. Similarly, *fen*, from Old English *fen(n)*, "a fen, a marsh, marshland", is known in many parts of the country and is found in literature and place-names accordingly. The word occurs in the late Scottish alliterative poem *Rauf Coilȝear* 444,[35] and is used in *The Wars of Alexander* 4358 in the specific sense of "clay" or "mud", itself attested elsewhere in Middle English. My Cheshire informant, interestingly enough, does not know the word.

But he does of course know the word *bog*, cognate with Irish *bogach* "marsh", which is rare in Middle English. The *Middle English Dictionary* cites no literary occurrences of *bog*, and I have found the word only in the Scottish alliterative poem *Golagrus and Gawain* 31.[36] A few medieval instances of the word occur in minor names and surnames from Somerset, Worcestershire, and the north country. The word has, however, gained wide currency in more recent times.

It is perhaps worth remembering that one topographical term, most frequently found in the west midlands does not appear to have been used by any alliterative poet. The element **wæsse*, not separately recorded in Old English, is sufficiently attested in West Midland place-names with the meaning "a wet place, a swamp, a marsh" to be regarded as a Middle English "swamp"-word in its own right. The Staffordshire names Alrewas and Hopwas, the Derbyshire Alderwasley, and the Shropshire Buildwas all contain this word, but I can find no evidence of its use in the dialects of these counties.

The foregoing discussion of "stream"-words and "swamp"-words has sought to provide further evidence of the connection between the more distinctive of such words in Middle English alliterative poetry and the appearance of the same words as elements in the place-names of what I have called the "real" *Gawain* country. The exact provenance of most of the alliterative poems will probably never be known for certain, but the works of the *Gawain*-poet at least have been authoritatively assigned on dialectal and graphemic grounds to the region of the southern Pennines, where the counties of Staffordshire, Cheshire, and Derbyshire meet, and where more northerly and more southerly linguistic features overlap.

Such words as *gufere* and *strynde*, and *kerre* and *misy*, and probably *warþe*, can confidently be ascribed to this region. Others, like *goter*, *rynel*, and *terne*, have somewhat wider regional associations. Of no less interest are several of the words used for "sea" in alliterative poetry, pointing, as in the case of *laye* or *loghe* and perhaps *bre*, to the poets' familiarity rather with mountain streams and pools than with the sea itself. The use of *borne* and *brok* in this way is characteristic of this tendency.

Although the works of the *Gawain*-poet provide an artistic focus for this and related topographical studies, other alliterative poems are not without effective landscape descriptions and interesting words to express them. *The Wars of Alexander* and *Morte Arthure*, for example, both contribute several noteworthy "water"-words and there are at least two unusual "swamp"-words, *sloh* and *wose*, in *Piers Plowman*. But Langland's landscapes are spiritual regions rather than representative of real English scenery, although some of the words he uses are firmly rooted in the west midland countryside with which he was familiar.[37] Other poets have their feet more firmly on the ground, and where a local word is used in what strikes the reader as somehow a life-like setting to a particular episode, he or she may well be justified in suspecting that the poet's picture owes some of its ingredients, scenic as well as lexical, to a familiar landscape. Nowhere is this feeling stronger than in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, for none of the alliterative poets has more successfully imparted to his descriptions impressions of authentic scenes such as we can still visit, for example, in the Goyt valley or along the moors of the Peak District.[38]

NOTES

[1] "Hills and Valleys in the *Gawain* Country", *Leeds Studies in English* 10 (1978) pp.19-41; "Woods and Forests in the *Gawain* Country", *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 80 (1979) pp.48-64.

[2] *The Wars of Alexander*, ed. W.W. Skeat, EETS, ES 47 (London, 1886); *The Awntyrs off Arthure at the Terne Wathelyn*, ed. R. Hanna III (Manchester, 1974); *Piers Plowman. The B Version*, ed. G. Kane and E.T. Donaldson (London, 1975); *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ed. J.R.R. Tolkien and E.V. Gordon, 2nd ed. revised by N. Davis (Oxford, 1967).

[3] See *Mum and the Sothsegger*, ed. M. Day and R. Steele, EETS, OS 199 (London, 1936) p.xviiff, 121.

[4] Cp. my "Staffordshire and Cheshire Landscapes in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*", *North Staffordshire Journal of Field Studies* 17 (1977) pp.20-49.

[5] I am grateful to Mr Alan Garner, himself an authority on East Cheshire dialect, for recording these responses which provide interesting, albeit inevitably limited, corroborative evidence for some of the words discussed.

[6] *The Quatrefoil of Love*, ed. Sir I. Gollancz and M.M. Weale, EETS, OS 195 (London, 1935).

[7] *Patience*, ed. J.J. Anderson (Manchester, 1969).

[8] *Pearl*, ed. E.V. Gordon (Oxford, 1953).

[9] R. Grandsaignes d'Hauterive, *Dictionnaire d'Ancien Français* (Paris, 1947) s.v. *goufre*.

[10] English Place-Name Society, 25-6, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1956; repr. 1970), hereinafter abbreviated in the text as AHS I or II.

[11] See *Medium Ævum* 2 (1933) p.176, and the note to lines 607-8 in Gordon's edition of *Pearl*.

[12] *Morte Arthure*, ed. J. Finlayson (London, 1967). Passages not included in Finlayson's shortened version are quoted from the edition by E. Brock, EETS, OS 8 (London, 1865).

[13] *Cleanness*, ed. J.J. Anderson (Manchester, 1977).

[14] *The "Gest Hystoriale" of the Destruction of Troy*, ed. G.A. Panton and D. Donaldson, EETS, OS 39 and 56 (London, 1869 and 1874).

[15] See M.T. Löfvenberg, *Studies on Middle English Local Surnames* (Lund, 1942) pp.20ff. Cp. also K. Cameron, *English Place-Names* (London, 1961) p.162ff.

[16] Cp. K. Cameron, *The Place-Names of Derbyshire*, EPNS 27-9, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1959) p.730.

[17] Cp. J. McN. Dodgson, *The Place-Names of Cheshire*, EPNS, 44-7, 4 vols. (Cambridge, 1970-72) I, p.162.

[18] *The Siege of Jerusalem*, ed. E. Kölbing and M. Day, EETS, OS 188 (London, 1932).

[19] *Pearl, Cleanness, Patience, Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ed. A.C. Cawley and J.J. Anderson, Everyman's Library (London, 1976).

[20] *Staffordshire Dialect Words. A Historical Survey* (Buxton and Stafford, 1974) p.53.

[21] *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F.N. Robinson (2nd ed., Cambridge, (Mass.) 1957).

[22] Egerton Leigh, *A Glossary of Words used in the Dialect of Cheshire* (London and Chester, 1877; repr. 1973) s.v. *stank*.

[23] See *ed.cit.*, p.32ff.

[24] *Alexander and Dindimus*, ed. W.W. Skeat, EETS, ES 31 (London, 1878).

[25] See Cameron, *The Place-Names of Derbyshire*, op.cit., p.741.

[26] E.g. Plaish in Shropshire, Plash in Somerset, Melplash in Dorset. Löfvenberg (p.152) cites the thirteenth-century personal name Hugh de Laplache from Somerset.

[27] *The Promptorium Parvulorum*, ed. A.L. Mayhew, EETS, ES 102 (London, 1908) p.350.

[28] 'Staffordshire and Cheshire Landscapes in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*'. See note 4.

[29] See E. Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names* (Oxford, 1960) s.vv. Mease, Meese; and cp. W.H. Duignan, *Notes on Staffordshire Place Names* (London, 1902) p.101.

[30] *The Parlement of The Thre Ages*, ed. M.Y. Offord, EETS, OS 246 (London, 1959).

[31] *William of Palerne*, ed. W.W. Skeat, EETS, ES 1 (London, 1867).

[32] Ed. W.W. Skeat (London, 1886; repr. 1954).

[33] G. Kristensson, *Studies on Middle English Topographical Terms* (Lund, 1970) p.46.

[34] Cp. the several editions of the poem, and P. Haworth, "'Warthe' in 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight'," *Notes and Queries* N.S. 14 (1967) pp.171-2.

[35] *Scottish Alliterative Poems*, ed. F.J. Amours, STS, OS 27, 38 (Edinburgh, 1897).

[36] *Scottish Alliterative Poems, ed.cit.*

[37] See my "The Langland Country" in *Piers Plowman. Critical Approaches*, ed. S.S. Hussey (London, 1969) pp.226-44.

[38] I gratefully acknowledge assistance in the preparation of this article from Mrs Ann Kelland, financial support from the Australian Research Grants Committee, and clerical assistance from the National Humanities Center, U.S.A.

KINGSHIP IN THE CHESTER NATIVITY PLAY

By RUTH M. KEANE

(i)

Of the four major English mystery cycles three have extant Nativity plays - York, *Ludus Coventriae* and Chester.[1] Even the most cursory reading of these three plays demonstrates that despite sharing common narrative material, they are totally different in theme and structure.

York XIV, with a cast of only two characters and a narrative concern only with events in Bethlehem, is the most narrowly focused of the three. The nativity is isolated in its context. The play is built on the opposition between worldly concerns embodied in Joseph and trust in God as embodied in Mary.[2] Joseph worries about immediate physical discomfort; Mary believes that her child will save them "fro sorowes sere" (32).[3] Joseph goes in search of light and fuel while Christ, the light of the world, is born and warmed by the animals, protected by God. The play culminates in Mary and Joseph's shared adoration of their "mercyfull maker" (148) to whom they pledge their "seruice" (146, 151).

Ludus Coventriae XV, by comparison, is a more extensive and discursive play which includes the journey to Bethlehem and the story of the midwives as well as the nativity. In common with other plays in the cycle the Nativity is firmly Marian in emphasis. Hence the playwright includes two miracles which underline Mary's virginity and the fact that she is the mother of God - the apocryphal story of the cherry tree and that of the withering and subsequent cure of Salome's hand.

Mary initiates a number of actions: she chooses to go to Bethlehem, to see her friends, and she is also the only cyclical Mary who is amused that Joseph should think midwives necessary (cf. ll.180, 181, 190). Joseph, on the other hand, bewails life in general and Octavian's tax in particular. He objects to the fact that he and Mary have to shelter in a stable whereas Mary accepts it.

Her role is strengthened by the reactions of the characters around her. Joseph's incredulity about the painless virgin birth is shared by the midwives, especially Salome, whose withered hand is cured only after she has asked forgiveness both of the child and of Mary. She promises:

> In every place I xal telle þis
> Of a clene mayd þat god is born
> ....
> His modyr a mayde as sche was be-forn
> natt fowle and polutyd as other women be
> but fayr and fresch as rose on thorn
> Lely wyte. clene with pure virginyte. (297-8; 301-4)

But it is in Chester that we find the most unexpected extension of the Nativity story, seen characteristically in its inclusion of "Roman" material. Unfortunately critics have, in general, misunderstood the art of the Chester dramatist in his Nativity play, and their condemnation of it arises largely because they have failed to recognise that it differs in kind from both York and *Ludus Coventriae*. Rosemary Woolf believes that the cycle

> bears a simple relationship to a few easily identifiable works. This simplicity of method is reflected in the thinness of the imaginative texture of the cycle.[4]

And Stanley Kahrl, writing specifically of nativity plays draws a distinction between York and Chester:

> Where the York nativity play is concentrated, economic, and characterised by dialogue consistently appropriate to the action presented, the playwright constructing the Chester Wrights' play has no sense of form. There is no stage in the author's mind for which he is writing.[5]

The purpose of this article is to begin to demonstrate Chester's unique dramatic principles and themes, especially that of kingship, while recognising that the birth of Christ in play VI is only one element in a complex dramatic structure. Before discussing the play as a whole, I shall assess the role of the principal character in the play, Octavian, Emperor of Rome.

(ii)

Octavian has often been seen as a typical stage tyrant, comparable with Herod, and the Pharoah and Cesar Augustus of the Towneley Cycle. In fact neither set of banns to the Chester plays is entirely consonant with Octavian as he appears in the extant play VI. The early banns refer to him as being "cruell and kene",[6] and the late banns depict him as

> Octauyan ye Emperowre, y^t^ could not well allowe
> ye pphesye of Anchant Sybell ye sage.[7]

In effect the banns seem to indicate a tyrannical emperor, in the tradition[8] which is manifested in Towneley IX. But the extant texts of the Chester cycle derive from an alternative tradition[9] in which Octavian is depicted as an exemplary monarch. It is true that

his first speech stresses his "powere" (185), and contains suggestions that the basis of this lies in the possibility open to him of using violence:

> kinge, prynce, baron, batchlere -
> I may destroy in great dangere
> through vertue of my degree. (190-2)

But gradually we realise this is not the traditional boast of a tyrant. Octavian's power is not illusory and he has used it to good effect. He has not only extended his kingdom more than any previous emperor (201-3), but, even more importantly, in doing this he has created world peace (237-8).

He is undoubtedly aware of his authority: "All leedes in land bee at my likinge" (225), and he demands "homage and feoaltye" (232) from all. But Chester VI demonstrates that Octavian's claims, unlike those of Cesar Augustus, are based on a realistic assessment of his achievements. His decision to implement a census is one facet of this. Octavian wishes to discover how many people he rules and to give them the means of acknowledging their obedience to him. It can truly be said to "preeve (his) might and (his) postee" (242). Cesar Augustus provides a contrast since he embarks on the census only at the instigation of his advisers, and does so not for Octavian's positive reasons, but to find and kill the child. Similarly Octavian's true authority is demonstrated in his relationship with Preco. Whereas Cesar Augustus threatens his messenger if he fails in his task (103-5), Octavian offers Preco a good horse and promises him a fair lady (277-80, 293-6). Octavian is the initiator of the commands he gives, whereas Augustus both admits his lack of good advisers (37-39) and seems uncertain himself about how to govern.

Preco's departure from the court to implement the census is followed by the entry of two senators who come as representatives of "poore and ryche" (302) to offer Octavian deification. Their stated reasons[10] for this are important as they give substance to Octavian's assertions of his power. The senators maintain that,

> . . . soe loved a lord, veramente,
> was never in this cyttye. (303-4)

They base this on three considerations. Firstly Octavian has never wronged his people (307-8), secondly he has brought them peace (309) and thirdly he has protected the people's rights (310). These reasons coincide exactly with Octavian's own claims - that, although he has power to cause suffering, he rules justly; that the people own their property only at his "leave", and that he has created peace (185-208).

Octavian's rejection of deification is equally rationally motivated by an appreciation of his mortality. He knows not only his powers but also his limitations. At the beginning of Octavian's opening speech he announces himself:

I, preeved prince most of powere,
under heaven highest am I here. (185-6)

"Under heaven" could, of course, merely mean "on earth", and thus be part of Octavian's boast of power. But in view of his later assertions of his mortality it seems reasonable to suppose that he is here acknowledging his worldly supremacy, but under a god. Herod, by contrast, later in the cycle, is the embodiment of a monarch who refuses to allow that his power is limited. He lives in a world of delusion, claiming to be king of all mankind (VIII, 177), yet he

is noe Jewe borne nor of that progenye,
but a stranger by the Romans made there kinge.
(VIII, 278-9)

Octavian is the true ruler of the world, Herod merely his underling. Yet even this is not the full extent of Herod's purported powers:

For I am kinge of all mankynde;
I byd, I beate, I loose, I bynde;
I maister the moone ....
....
I am the greatest above degree
that is, or was, or ever shalbe;
the sonne yt dare not shine on me
and I byd him goe downe. (VIII, 177-9, 181-4)

The biblical echoes[11] as well as the sheer outrageousness of Herod's claims ironically reinforce the vacuity of his assertions.

Yet Octavian, the true king of the world, is completely aware of his humanity and therefore of his mortality. He elaborates this theme at great length stressing[12] that he must die (319), that he, unlike God, had a beginning and will have an end (329-32), and characterising himself as an old man (327-8). He is, however, prepared to consult the Sibyl to ascertain whether there will ever be a higher earthly king than himself (347-8). Although she later qualifies her answer by relating it to the coming of God's son, the Sibyl's initial answer is "yes" (349) - quite enough to enrage a Cesar Augustus or a Herod. Yet Octavian hears her out, asking only when the reign of the king to come will begin.

Traditionally[13] the Sibyl requests three days to pray before giving her answer and the Chester dramatist utilises this aspect of the legend to place Octavian's vision, rather than Christ's birth at the climax of his play. So it is after the dramatisation of the Nativity that Octavian receives confirmation from the Sibyl that the child in his vision will surpass him (644-50). He willingly accepts this:

Should I bee God? Naye, naye, witterlye!
Great wronge iwys yt were.

For this childe is more worthye
then such a thowsande as am I. (661-4)

He subsequently calls the child "prince of postye" (672) and acknowledges himself "his subject" (673). Thus, in his greatest self-abasement Octavian, emperor of the world, achieves the greatest ratification of his authority and power, endorsed by a vision sent from God. Yet although prostrating himself before the child, Octavian loses none of his earthly power. He immediately takes up again his duty to rule, and his last words are those of command to his senators, so that all his citizens will worship the child as he has done.

Thus Octavian's initial regal monologue, his implementation of the census, his relationship with Preco, and his rejection of deification can all be seen as dramatic preparation for the most forcible exhibition of Octavian's true stature as monarch, in his encounter with the Sibyl.

Octavian is thus consistently portrayed in Chester VI more as an exemplary king than as the tyrant which one might expect from the banns. He does not even undergo, as Clopper has suggested, a transition from "boasting tyrant" to "humble suppliant".[14] Rather the tone of his opening speech carries suggestions of what might have been, which the content of his speech belies.[15] This semi-conscious reminder of a typical despot, embodied later in Herod, only underlines the extent of his wisdom and humility.

(iii)

Chester VI can be conveniently discussed in the four sections demarcated by the direct address of a character to the audience (i.e. by the Nuntius at line 177, by Preco at 373 and by the Expositor at 564). Sections one and three focus on Mary's Judean world; sections two and four (discussed in (ii) above) on Octavian's world in Rome. But the sections are linked thematically especially in their exploration of the nature of kingship.

Mary is at the centre of the action in section one yet she is merely the vehicle of God's plan. In fact she is never praised by any other character in the play except in terms of her role as divine agent. Like the other cyclical Annunciation plays Chester's is based on the Gospel account (Luke i, 26-38), but its opening lines,

Hayle be thow, Marye, mother free,
full of grace. God is with thee.
Amongst all women blessed thow bee,
and the fruite of thy bodye (1-4)

derive from the liturgical "Hail Mary". Thus the Chester Mary is confronted from the outset with a situation demanding greater faith than that asked of the other Marys. She is addressed not only as the chosen of God, but also as the bearer of a child. Her consent

is not invited, only her obedience to the will of God. Luke's gospel initially only indicates that Mary was afraid and wondered what the angel could mean: "Quae cum audisset, turbata est in sermone eius; et cogitabat qualis esset ista salutatio" (v. 29). But the Chester Mary is certain from the outset of her position in relation to God:

> Ah, lord that syttes high in see,
> that wondrouslye now mervayles mee -
> a simple mayden of my degree
> bee greete this gratiously. (5-8)

She is aware of her lowliness but also completely understands and accepts God's commands. Her "wondering" is that God's plan should be implemented by means of someone so lowly. Indeed Mary's most important characteristic is that she is "poor"[16] both materially and spiritually.

The Christ-child to come, on the other hand, is presented as a figure of majesty and power. Gabriel elaborates on Christ's kingship throughout a whole stanza (17-24). He shall be given David's "see" and reign in Jacob's house "with full might". And it is because of Christ's "endlesse liffe" (an idea significant in relation to Octavian's mortality) that he shall have "such renowne and ryaltye" as no-one has ever had previously. This idea of Christ's royalty is developed in Chester's long recension of the "Magnificat" (65-112). In it he is specifically designated "prince" (81) (the gospel has no source for this in the "Magnificat"), whereas Mary is merely "his feere of meane degree" (76).

This humble self-abasement by the Chester Mary is in sharp contrast to her presentation in the other English cycles. In *Ludus Coventriae* it is her free consent to the will of God that is important:

> Whow þe holy gost blyssyd he be
> A-bydyth þin answere and þin assent. (XI, 263-4)

In Towneley X, although Mary's consent is not invited, Gabriel bows to her and addresses her as "godis spouse" (78), queen of virgins (80) and "woman most of mede" (86), so that the emphasis is on her pre-eminence. Even in York, which follows the Vulgate closely in suggesting Mary's acceptance, it is God's will rather than her humble status that is apparent:

> I love my lorde with herte dere,
> Þe grace þat he has for me layde.
> Goddis handmayden, lo! me here,
> To his wille all redy grayd,
> Be done to me of all manere,
> Thurgh thy worde als þou hast saide. (XII, 187-92)

Mary in Chester, on the other hand, says:

> Now syth that God will yt soe bee,
> and such grace hath sent to mee,
> blessed evermore bee hee;
> to please him I am payde. (41-44)

And the play's first section concludes with Joseph's doubts, this scene, too, stressing not Mary's holiness but "Godes will" (164). Joseph, having realised that he is mistaken about Mary's infidelity, does not beg her forgiveness but instead worships God (173-6).[17]

This humble world, miraculously illuminated and elevated by God's favour in the opening section, is further explored in section three, by its incorporation into a universal perspective of nations and politics as Octavian's temporal power reaches into Judea from Rome compelling Mary and Joseph to Bethlehem. With this political perspective comes a clearer recognition of a worldly hierarchy which is based on both social rank and on material possession and which therefore stands in contrast to the unseen realm of divine power. The contrast between the two worlds of Rome and Judea is central to an understanding of the play's climax in section four.

Preco opens section three by announcing Octavian's census. Joseph objects but submits to the Emperor's power as he did earlier to the power of God. He is a "citizen" both of the worldly and the divine kingdoms. But his speech stresses his poverty and that of "the poore" (390-414) in comparison with the "castle", "towre" and "manere" of the rich. Mary's vision on the way to Bethlehem (found dramatised only in Chester)[18] extends the audience's concept of rich and poor. She sees two groups of people, one rejoicing, the other in sorrow. And she learns from an angel that the former, the "commen people" (439) are those who will accept Christ. The "morneinge men" (445) are the Jews whose pride will prevent their understanding "that God for man shall light soe lowe" (450).

The idea of Christ's material poverty is stressed in the Nativity just as Mary's was earlier. Mary and Joseph shelter in the stable not just because there was "no room at the inn" and they are poor, but also because "greate lordes of stowte araye / occupye this cyttye" (455-6). Yet even Joseph realises that this is part of God's plan "to make men meeke" (459).[19] Despite the majesty of God, which the opening section of play VI strongly asserted, Christ is born in a stable.

The episode of the midwives, however, re-establishes the paradoxical nature of Christ's kingship by re-affirming the power of God. Tebell greets the child by calling on "dere lord, heaven kinge" (525), but Salome, in doubting Mary's virginity "would tempte Goddes might" (545). The angel in commanding her to ask the child's forgiveness stresses "Godes owne powere, / to bringe mankinde owt of dangere" (554). This is endorsed by the cure of Salome's hand. She asked the child alone for mercy, not Mary and her son as in the *Ludus Coventriae* play. Salome also closes the Nativity scene with an affirmation of her belief in God and in Christ:

> Nowe leeve I well and sickerlye
> that God is commen, man to forbye.
> And thou, lord, thou art hee. (561-3)

The authority of God and that of Octavian, however, have been counterpointed throughout the play and lie at the heart of its structure. The important word-patterns related to kingly power are applied equally to both. For example, Christ shall reign with "full might" (20), Mary bears him through "Godes might" (31) and God through his "myght gave maystery" (93). Compare Octavian's words: "I am the manfulst man of might" (223). He orders the census to prove his "might" and "postee" (242). The Sibyl prays to "greatest God of might" (368) and Preco delivers the command from Octavian "myche of might" (377). As if to cement the link between Octavian and God, at the moment of Christ's birth Mary uses the very words Octavian used in ordering the census but with reference to the child:

> Lord, thanked bee thow, full of might,
> for preeved is thy postee. (503-4)[20]

Paradoxically Octavian and Christ are also linked through their humility. Christ is born in a stable "to make men meeke" (459). In contrast, Octavian the highest authority in the Gentile world, and also Emperor of the Judean world, physically abases himself, offering incense to the child and acknowledging himself "his subject" (673). As Octavian is so well aware, although parallels exist between his position and God's, the crucial difference is that he will die. Octavian's rule is exemplary in the temporal sphere, but it is transitory. God's perfect rule is divine and eternal. This, Octavian demonstrates in his homage to the child in his vision.

Thus in Chester VI the faith and humility which Mary has and which Joseph learns, are also central to the Octavian story. The poor - rich antithesis, which is introduced in the "Magnificat" is developed in the journey to Bethlehem and brought to completion in the contrast between the poverty of the stable and the opulence of Rome. Ultimately Christ's kingship is established as something different from worldly expectations of monarchy, yet is confirmed by the homage not only of the Jewish midwives, but also of the Emperor of Rome.

(iv)

The Chester Nativity play is thus very different from both York and *Ludus Coventriae*. By including such diverse material the Chester playwright set himself the potentially very difficult task of unifying his play. But this, I believe, he has achieved by focusing on the theme of kingship and by counterpointing Judean and Roman scenes, exploring the opposition and parallels between Jewish and Gentile worlds. An understanding of the one is necessary to a full understanding of the other. Octavian's role is thus vital to the dominant themes of Chester VI.

It is in the contrast between Mary and Octavian on the one hand, and Octavian and God on the other that his role emerges. Octavian is a king who (i) uses reason in his understanding of his

mortality, (ii) is open to prophetic revelation, (iii) has his faith confirmed by a vision sent from God and (iv) is the means by which not only peace, but also true religion is established in his kingdom. The dramatist has not just written a simple Nativity play but by incorporating pre-nativity and Roman material has explored the nature of kingship, highlighting the importance of true humility, and affirmed the importance of faith. As the expositor concludes:

> Wherby you may take good teene
> that unbeleeffe is a fowle sinne,
> as you have seene within this playe. (720-2)

To this end the Chester dramatist has carefully selected and organised his material.

In this process the role of Mary has been subordinated and her veneration of the child has been largely replaced by that of Octavian. One can only speculate on the reasons for this but perhaps in the light of Clopper's research[21] which would seem to indicate that virtually the whole of Chester in its extant form appears to be of a much later date than has often been acknowledged, the Nativity may have been reworked in order to conform more closely with Reformation theology. The early banns seem to imply that Octavian originally appeared as a tyrannical figure and in them the "cariage (is) of marie myld quene".[22] The later glorification of Octavian effectively removes the emphasis from Mary, while his humility preserves the centrality of Christ's nativity. This presentation of Octavian may also have been politically astute if seen as an indirect praise of monarchical power rightly used.

NOTES

1 York XIV, *Ludus Coventriae* XV, Chester VI. Towneley may well have had a Nativity play, but it is no longer extant.

2 For a much fuller account of the York Nativity play see J.W. Robinson, "A Commentary on the York Play of the Birth of Jesus", *JEGP* 70 (1971) pp.241-54.

3 Quotations from the cycles will be taken from the following editions: *The York Plays*, ed. L.T. Smith (Oxford 1885; reissued 1963); *Ludus Coventriae*, ed. K.S. Block, EETS, ES 110 (London, 1922; reprinted 1960); *The Chester Mystery Cycle*, ed. R.M. Lumiansky and David Mills, EETS, SS 3 (London, 1974); *The Towneley Plays*, ed. George England, EETS, ES 71 (London, 1897). Plays other than those indicated in note 1 above will be designated by roman numerals.

4 *English Mystery Plays* (London, 1972) p.306.

5 *Traditions of Medieval English Drama* (London, 1974) p.57.

6 *The Trial and Flagellation with other studies in the Chester Cycle*, ed. F.M. Salter and W.W. Greg, Malone Society (Oxford, 1935) p.134, l.126.

7 *Ibid*, p.153, ll.167-8.

8 See for example Ranulph Higden, *Polychronicon*, ed. Churchill Babington and J.R. Lumby, 9 vols. (London, 1865-86) IV, p.296; and John Lydgate, *The Fall of Princes*, ed. Henry Bergen, EETS, ES 121-4 (London, 1924-7) Bk. VI, 1-76. For a full discussion of the conflicting traditions concerning Octavian see Ruth M. Keane, *The Theme of Kingship in the Chester Cycle*, M.A. Thesis (University of Liverpool, 1977) Chap. II.

9 See, for example, *Mirabilia Romae*, ed. G. Parthey (Berlin, 1869) pp.33-4; and *Legenda Aurea*, ed. Th. Graesse (3rd ed., rep. Osnabrück, 1969) Cap. VI, 44-5. The *Polychronicon* also transmits the Ara Coeli legend with its glorification of Octavian. (ed. cit., IV, 298-300).

10 In, for example, *A Stanzaic Life of Christ*, ed. Frances A. Foster, EETS, OS 166 (London, 1926), the *Mirabilia Romae* and the *Polychronicon* deification is offered for different reasons. I have found no analogue where the reasons coincide exactly with those given in Chester.

11 Cf. Matthew xvi, 18-19.

12 There is no similar elaboration of this idea in any of Chester's purported sources such as the *Stanzaic Life*.

13 See, for example, the *Mirabilia*.

14 L.M. Clopper, *The Structure of the Chester Cycle, Text, Theme and Theatre,* Ph.D. Thesis (Ohio State University, 1969) p.227.

15 It is possible that the speech retains traces, e.g. in the French sections, of an earlier tyrannical Octavian, from a previous stage of the cycle's development.

[16] Cf. Mary's portrayal in Chester IX, e.g. 11.48-9.

[17] Compare Towneley X, 356-8, York XIII, 294-6, and *Ludus Coventriae* XII, 193-212.

[18] The vision is derived ultimately from the apocryphal gospels (cf. Book of James xvii 1 and Pseudo Matthew xiii 1), but cf. *Stanzaic Life* 357-92 for a somewhat different interpretation of the happy and sad people.

[19] Cf. Chester IX, 23.

[20] Similar word patterns of "postee", "power" and "dignity" can be traced through the play with reference to both Octavian and Christ just as they both possess "blys".

[21] See e.g. "The History and the Development of the Chester Cycle", *Modern Philology* 75 (1977-8) pp.219-46.

[22] F.M. Salter and W.W. Greg, *op.cit.*, p.134, 1.125.

"THIS VAGUE RELATION:" HISTORICAL FICTION AND HISTORICAL VERACITY IN THE LATER MIDDLE AGES

By RUTH MORSE

The relation between history and fiction is of paramount interest for students of the novel, but has been neglected by medievalists. Historians of the Middle Ages have in recent years devoted considerable attention to the question, What is truth in medieval historical writing? Beginning from the point of view of the reader of medieval romance, especially "historical" romance, I approach a related question from a different angle: What things authorized and controlled invention in medieval "historical" writing? I put "historical" in quotation marks because the specific body of texts with which I am concerned here lies somewhere between our ideas of history and fiction. The methodological implications of my argument are applicable to a larger range of works, some of which I have dealt with at greater length elsewhere,[1] but I wish to make it clear that in this article I write as a student of the late medieval historical romance and not as a bona fide historiographer. Beginning with the familiar problem of romances which claim to be histories, in Part I I return to antiquity in search of reasons. In Part II I briefly show what we gain by a recreation of the context of historical writing, and I end with some general reflections on the importance of certain kinds of background study for the understanding of medieval generic categories.

I

There is a certain puzzle for readers of romances which claim to be true, or, at least, historical. Their claim tends to come in two forms. One is the appeal to a particular authority or book, as for example, when Geoffrey of Monmouth claims that his history is authorized by a book in the ancient British tongue lent to him by his friend Walter; when Boccaccio quotes Theodontius in the *Genealogia*; when Chaucer relies upon Lollius. Since this kind of claim can be checked, we suspend our suspicions of forgery, ill-will, or, more sympathetically, jeu d'esprit, until we have exhausted the potential sources and, sometimes, our patience. The second claim is to a general knowledge of events, when a reference sends us to other sources to see how accurately the past is being reported, by Benoît, or by one of the authors of the romances of Troy, or by Froissart. Although authors may be cited by name, in this sort of historical romance the author relies upon an assumption of common knowledge. With this kind of romance we tend to check the narrative against other reports, to search for historical parallels

(as for *Horn* or *Havelok*) or references to actual campaign routes which heroes follow (as for some of the Arthurian romances). There is an empirically based tendency to conclude that in the more sophisticated romances a reference to historical authority is a sure sign that what we are reading is a fiction. Indeed, we have two ways of dealing with such appeals: either they are as conventional to romance as the May opening is to a dream vision, or they are instances of the naiveté of an unhistorical imagination. In neither case do we ask what medieval authors mean by their claim.

That there is a confusion in our minds can be shown if we look briefly at a familiar distinction as it was drawn by a well known scholar, W.P. Ker. Ker, and many others, liked to divide medieval narrative into Epic and Romance. "Whatever Epic may mean, it implies some weight and solidity; Romance means nothing, if it does not convey some notion of mystery and fantasy."[2] This sounds rather dated now, but we have only to think of John Finlayson's introduction to the alliterative *Morte Arthure* to realise how current this kind of division is, though we might now find scholars less keen to emphasize the "mystery and fantasy".[3] Ker saw Epic as an exercise of the dramatic imagination upon history and stressed the interplay of heroic characters over "the historic importance or the historic results of the events with which" poets dealt (p.20). This line of argument led Ker to a logical difficulty about the relation of Epic to historical veracity. "The strange thing is that this vague relation should be so necessary to heroic poetry . . . . Heroic poetry is not, as a rule, greatly indebted to historical fact for its material. The epic poet does not keep record of the great victories or the great disasters. He cannot, however, live without the ideas and sentiments of heroism that spring up naturally in periods like those of the Teutonic migrations" (pp.25-6). Now Ker's sense that it is the interplay of characters which makes good epic poetry depends on the idea that the characters are the invention of the poet. For Ker, the significance of the events depends on the poet's and his audience's belief that they are historical. Then, however, he leaves the problem of what the "vague relation" between characters and events might be to posit a literary category which he calls Epic. Authors are praised or blamed according to the closeness of their achievement to the kind of poem best represented by the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the *Nibelungenlied*, *Beowulf*, and others. At one extreme the genre can be defined by actual formal rules abstracted from classical Epic, so that the 1584 Scots *Judith* is an epic because it is in verse, opens with an invocation, and begins *in medias res*. At the other extreme, Saints' Lives or Romances define Epic by exclusion. This exclusion reinforced the separation of what seemed to be quite obviously different kinds of writing. Poems are epics for Ker, Finlayson, and others, when their characters (usually men) espouse heroic values, and when their plots stand in a "vague relation" to history. The problems of this approach are obvious. The argument is circular: a narrative is categorized as epic when it corresponds to an idea of Epic built on a number of works which may or may not describe *themselves* as epics. The kinds of adjectives with which such compositions are praised, words like "virile", "vigorous", etc., reveal certain underlying

prejudices about the superiority of Epic. This kind of classically-based literary category-distinction will not do. Poems like the *Siege of Jerusalem* or the *Destruction of Troy* at one boundary, *Guy of Warwick* at another, break the bounds of Ker's categories; and the prose histories, or historical romances, cannot be accommodated at all. Medieval historical writing cannot be made to fit ideal literary types. Moreover, literary categories do not deal with the problem of what medieval men meant when they said that they were writing true tales about the past.

Because medieval historians had no sense of their writing as purely independent literary creation, it is not surprising that the application of purely literary generic categories obscures rather than illuminates medieval attitudes toward "true tales about the past". The relevant context for medieval historical writing is to be found in antiquity, though modified to some extent by Christian revelation. The idea of history, rather than Romance or Epic, provides the appropriate intellectual context for an analysis of historical writing. In antiquity the theory and practice of history, as the theory of fiction, were tied together by rhetorical considerations about narratives generally.

For those of us who are not classical scholars, Herodotus and Thucydides are likely to loom as the models upon which ancient history was based. This was not, however, the view of writers who succeeded them. The kinds of ethnographic and other research which Herodotus attempted seemed to later historians methodologically impracticable. In this they were right. In an age without documents, reliance on traditions of hearsay seemed to be the only memory of the past. When documents did begin to appear, they brought with them intractable problems of forgery. Methods such as numismatic, archæological, or even stylistic analysis upon which our historians depend did not yet exist. Given this reliance upon hearsay (which would not do for legal evidence, after all) it is no wonder that Herodotus founded no school. Nor was Thucydides much more successful in providing a standard model. His attempt to solve Herodotus's problem of evidence had been to write about his own times, about events which he had witnessed himself, or events about which other living witnesses could be consulted. But if *The Peloponnesian Wars* established the model of how a historical subject should be chosen, it did not establish an accepted standard of how historians should proceed. Thucydides' idea of "scientific" history did not take, though he made war (political history) the paramount subject and the reportorial the paramount style. It is for style that Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* X) recommends both Herodotus and Thucydides, whom he matches with Livy and Sallust respectively in a certain indication that his eye is not on veracity of content.

The explanation for the failure of historians after Herodotus and Thucydides to follow their standards is given by historiographers in terms of the rise of rhetoric as the controlling discipline in classical education:

> Serious study of psychology and morality passed to the philosophers; history became either pedestrian fact-finding or a vehicle for political propaganda and

> emotional appeal; a writer's success was measured by his rhetoric and pathos, his entertainment value, rather than by truth and understanding . . . . In a formal sense, history had quickly fallen victim to the great curse of post-fifth-century Greek culture-rhetoric. The emergence of oratory as an art-form in itself was but one example of a pervasive evil. Another was manifest in education; Isocrates triumphed over Plato and rhetoric was elevated above philosophy in the curriculum of the higher schools which became a feature of Hellenistic and Roman Greece. The servant had become master: the manner in which an idea was expressed became more important than the idea itself.[4]

Similarly, Nancy Streuver writes:

> In the Hellenistic period the rhetorical historians forego their historical purpose (of confronting their reconstructed reality and extracting meaning from it alone) to create a tragic or pathetic scene which would move their readers to pity or terror.[5]

But before turning to rhetoric, one must attempt to identify the distinguishing features of late classical history, since the works of men like Lucan, Sallust, and Suetonius were to become the agreed models for medieval writers.

The forms, conventions and style by which we recognize that a long narrative is meant as "history" are readily identifiable. The author announces his subject, which is, following Thucydides' restriction of subject and time, almost always taken from the recent past, and, ideally, events which the author experienced. It begins at the beginning, recounts the political and military deeds of those men (occasionally, though exceptionally, women) who influenced the course of events which were of importance to the city or state, describes anecdotal material which illuminates the effects of those men and events upon the city or state, draws from this narration lessons of individual and corporate behaviour, and ends. We might want to distinguish "biography" as a recognizable subset. The historian's style is recognizable by its verisimilitude and seriousness. Verisimilitude is not the same as true reporting, and no one would ever assume that the historian presented the actual words of the speakers whose famous orations he reported. As early as Herodotus, and with especial brilliance in Thucydides, the writing of speeches was a highly esteemed part of the historian's art. Part of his skill was his invention of words appropriate to the argument which had been propounded. No one disputed the historian's right to attribute his own words to a historical speaker. Erasmus still took this for granted when he advised potential writers on "copiousness".[6]

The right of invention is an important point, though one which may seem obvious. The principle which justifies it is that it is the recreation of the argument rather than the orator's personal

style which counts. Of equal importance, the convention of unspecified invention was not limited to words. The situation in which they were spoken, with all its circumstantial detail, was equally open to literary modification according to the skill of the writer. Indeed, his skill was measured according to his manipulation. To put it sympathetically, historians were praised for their ability to reduce the flux of the past to an ordered, patterned account. In this, the classical historian was close to the poet, a conjunction which was not unnoted at the time.[7] To Cicero, Herodotus was both the father of history and the father of lies, and no one seems to have found this strange until Petrarch.[8] "History" meant, and still means, a subject; it implied a style, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus pointed out in his *Letter to Pompey*.[9] For Dionysius, however, this distinction was only a convenience for literary discussion, and was not developed either by him or by later theorists. History was supposed to record what had happened in a manner which was verisimilar, but a good deal more modification was permitted, even expected, than might be predicted from the writers' pronouncements. The truth was embroidered with a certain amount of plausible invention even when the author did not mean to slant or distort the past. Indeed, his invention might be the best way he could find to make his conception of the past convincing. In the hands of a man who was trying to justify the present, this could, and did, result in something which has for us the most unpleasant connotations: forgery and propaganda are but two of the names by which we designate partisan accounts of the past. But before our empirical and positivist age, the case for the historian was different. It was almost impossible for untrue history to be falsified where there was no exterior criterion of verifiability beyond the memory and judgement of the reader. The plausibility or inconsistency of single, or contradictory accounts provided no obvious means of proof. The reader was in the position of having to make judgements about the truth or falsehood of a historical account on literary grounds.

Given that the "facts" of any history might be assailed, its value as moral and political example provided its defence.[10] Sometimes tacitly, but often explicitly, historians claimed that it was right to remember the deeds done in the past and the fates of groups of men in order to learn to guide our own conduct and to give us a sense of the fortunes of the world. It is to be found over and over in ancient, and, as we shall see, in medieval histories. It occurs in Polybius, the lone follower of Thucydides' "scientific" method:

> But all historians . . . have impressed on us that the soundest education and training for a life of active politics is the study of History, and that the surest and indeed the only method of learning how to bear bravely the vicissitudes of fortune, is to recall the calamities of others.[11]

That this attitude continued for over 1,000 years is one of the themes of Professor Hexter's essay on the education of the aristocracy in the Renaissance.[12] It is the attitude attacked by

Macchiavelli, who suggests that there are more useful lessons to be learned.

The moral claim of history was twofold. Since examples gain force because they are true, history may be said to be superior to poetry. Since true examples are more forceful than precepts alone, history may be said to be superior to moral philosophy. While neither of these claims was to go unchallenged, the poets and philosophers having rather a lot to say for themselves, they remained commonplace arguments.[13] This covering law that truth is *morally* superior to fiction, and, concomitantly, the fear that fiction might be by its very nature corrupting, was to appear and reappear in classical thought. Plato discusses the problem in the *Republic* (II, 378), where we come across the kind of argument which was to be important throughout the Middle Ages, and one which was echoed in the eighteenth century by Dr Johnson in *Rambler* no. 4. This argument stressed the moral force of a fictional example which is *believed* to be true, though it is a refinement which contradicts the basic premise. Plato wanted certain versions of the past (e.g. that no citizen ever quarreled with another citizen) to be presented to his citizens as a true report in order to influence their behaviour. Johnson repeatedly stressed the importance of poetic justice. The implication of this kind of use of the "past" is that the report may be manipulated on moral grounds, a sort of morally inspired forgery. This rewriting or invention of stories which were to be presented as historical was to be particularly important in Christian Europe in the writing of saints' lives and the material now known as the Apocryphal Gospels. Though we usually call these tales "pious frauds", they belong to recognizable historical categories.

The right of invention was important not only to historians, but to poets, whose source material was traditionally historical. Since their use of plausible invention was so much more obvious than the use made by historians, and since it is literary theory which survives, we have considerable comment on the problem as it applied to writers of Epic and Tragedy. Poets had not only to choose among a variety of versions of what had happened in the past, but they had also to fill in the details about which report was silent. Different dramatists gave Iphigenia different fates, or disagreed over the circumstances of Orestes' revenge. Examples of poets who contradicted all the traditional accounts also exist, as in the *Medea* of Euripides: that Medea should murder her own children in order to ruin Jason was Euripides' invention.[14] Virgil certainly invented Aeneas's adventure with Dido; Macrobius's *Saturnalia* preserves for us some of the adverse comment which this manipulation of history aroused. There seem to be two criteria to apply to the works of the poets. First, the more remote the period, the more permissible (and of course the more necessary) plausible invention became. Secondly, the manipulation of the past was necessary to the poet because it was the way in which he brought out the moral truths which were his real concern. To later readers, however, the inventions of Euripides and Virgil looked as authentic, or even more so, than many other accounts.

Here again we are tending by implication to a position where invention is justified by the ends of the work, and morally inspired fiction becomes acceptable. In a culture where the "true" facts are known, the inspired fiction can be seen for what it is. When the surrounding cultural facts have been lost, the fiction may take the place of the truth. The interpretation of Dares and Dictys throughout the Middle Ages as the eye-witness accounts they pretend to be is an example of a problem which classical thinkers had anticipated.[15]

Worries about fictions which look like history are found not only in formal discussions but in asides in the writing of philosophers and theorists. Julian the Apostate wrote:

> It would be fitting for us to make acquaintance with those histories which are written about deeds actually done in the past; but we must deprecate those fictions put forth by previous writers in the form of history, that is, love stories, and, in a word, all such stuff.[16]

We may wish that Julian had given us more than "all such stuff" to refer to the fictions he deprecated, but it is clear that he was aware of the distinction between history as substance (deeds actually done in the past) and a style of writing which is historical (in the form of history). This distinction seems to have escaped the writers of Rhetoric books: history as substance and history as style appeared as one word, without clarification, in the manuals which the Middle Ages inherited from antiquity. We are left with the assumption that writers who have something important to say (i.e. some moral end) will use the past properly. The rest is a waste of time. The difficulty of distinguishing the convincing from the true is acknowledged but unresolved.[17]

Any consideration of the Arts of Poetry (or Rhetoric) among medievalists is likely to bring with it a certain confusion, since we tend to identify the term with those texts edited by Edmond Faral.[18] There are, however, textbooks from Cicero onwards which deserve this appellation. It is only in the last few years that the assumptions underlying these texts, and, in fact, the texts themselves, have been made available to readers who are put off by the long columns in Migne.[19] This recent work, which supersedes that of such pioneers as Baldwin and Atkins,[20] helps to reorient our view of what medieval writers believed about the theory of narrative by showing not only that they had such theories, but by showing how differently their theories were organized. This is not literary criticism, but education and the organization of knowledge: literature (as we think of it) is not cut off from other forms of writing and speaking. Epic shades into Romance or biography, or the three into Lives of Saints, without any rigorous exclusive claims.

Roman rhetoric is homogeneous enough that we can generalize about its precepts and be certain that we can find examples of a common tradition in the pages of Cicero, Quintilian, or the Auctor ad Herennium. This same tradition was preserved throughout the Middle Ages whenever scholars wrote about Rhetoric; and since Grammar, Rhetoric, and Dialectic form the Trivium, the axioms of

the Ciceronian tradition were widespread indeed. We are interested in what the rhetoricians had to say about narration. Cicero, in the *De Inventione*, defined narration as "an exposition of events that have occurred or are supposed to have occurred" (*Narratio est rerum gestarum aut ut gestarum expositio* [I, xix]). The Latin indicates a technical term which is hidden in translation: *res gesta* and its derivatives in the European vernaculars had a particularity of meaning which we tend to neglect, whether it be history or law.[21] In the *Ad Herennium* (I, viii) representation is subdivided three ways. The first two are strictly congruent with political and forensic oratory and need not concern us. They include the discussion for the reason of the case at issue and digression for the purpose of comparison, *ad hominem* attack, or amplification. The third division deals with narration for its own sake. This canonic analysis is to be found with slight modifications in rhetorical works from Priscian to John of Garland, and remains recognizable in the last two chapters of Boccaccio's *Genealogia Deorum*.[22] There is some critical disagreement over what Cicero meant when he said that his three parts included both events and persons. He described three kinds of representation of events. *Fabula* is a narration which is neither true nor verisimilar, that is, you could not mistake it for something which had happened. Often, *fabulae* contain morals, as in the fables of Aesop. Secondly, *argumentum* is a fictitious narrative which is verisimilar. It is associated with the style of representation used by comedy, and with hypothetical cases in actual law suits. Thirdly, *historia* is a verisimilar account of actual events. About the persons represented Cicero says very little beyond telling us that they show their mental attitudes through their conversation and their acts; the subject had been covered in some detail by Aristotle in the *Rhetoric*. Ker's idea that Epic gives us human beings owes more to the ethos created by Bradley than to the kind of creation which Cicero probably meant.

What is important is that the rhetoric manuals thus reinforced, in what must be to modern eyes rather an unexpected corner, the idea of *historia* as a category both of style and substance which we have already discovered in the practice of the historians themselves. The assumption basic to the culture is that the governing category is "writing" itself, rather than the distinct categories we make of "history" and "literature". In antiquity, history might be well or badly written in verse or prose, but its style was to be evaluated on the same kinds of grounds which applied to Epic or Tragedy. This is why we find Geoffrey of Vinsauf and John of Garland listing history as a kind of narrative used by Tragedy, Comedy, and the Church.[23] The amalgamation of these three is more natural than it would be starting from the point of view of modern literary criticism, since the description of writing begins from the point of view which uses Rhetoric to organize formal public speaking. That history was seen as one of the kinds of persuasive writing meant that whoever did it, it was susceptible to the rules which the rhetoricians applied to all kinds of composition. The kinds of exercise which the Rhetoricians set in their schools were employed as a matter of course by classical writers. The description of a character, the throes of a difficult decision, the defence of a course taken - these set scenes appeared and reappeared, creating

practical precedents for the Middle Ages.[24]

Indeed, this freedom to manipulate speeches is one which historians discussed as a theoretical issue while continuing to do as they had always done. "Justin" explains one of his own embellishments of his model as follows:

> His [Mithradates'] speech, on this occasion, I have thought of such importance that I insert a copy of it in this brief work. Trogus Pompeius has given it in the oblique form, as he finds fault with Livy and Sallust for having exceeded the proper limits of history, by inserting direct speeches in their works only to display their own eloquence.[25]

While "Justin's" disagreement with Trogus Pompeius raises numerous questions about his attitudes to authority and evidence, it certainly points towards "normal" expectations.

This view of invention should help to explain why speeches in literature were for so long naturally, that is, habitually, written as rehearsals of arguments or statements of position rather than as expressions of the character's inner psychological state. This is not for a moment to suggest that literary characterization as we understand it did not exist in antiquity or in the Middle Ages; it is to attempt to identify the norms. And the norm of characterization, as those who teach other medieval literature than such exceptional authors as Chaucer know, continued to be defined from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* to Erasmus's *De Copia* by age and status and not by any of those gratuitous idiosyncrasies which make us think that the description is of that particular person and of him only. This is also particularly frustrating for readers of medieval biographies, who long to hear something particular, anything individual about the protagonists, whose deeds of war or sanctity have inspired an author to preserve their memory.

The normal expectations which the Middle Ages inherited from Antiquity derived from classical texts of several kinds. In addition to such models of history writing as Lucan, Sallust, and Suetonius, medieval writers referred to the "historians" Virgil, Statius, or Dares and Dictys. They were not unable to distinguish history from "poetry" but believed the historical parts of Epics to be extractable by the acute reader. Important Roman histories were amalgamated and translated at an early date as *Li Fet des Romains*.[26] In these models medieval writers found the conventions of subject, style, and set scenes which belonged to the writing of history. For theory and prescription, the rhetoric manuals provided approval of the use of a serious plain style for historical narratives, and made it the normal prose style. Because the *artes* were not analytical, underlying questions about the manipulation of historical facts, the difficulties of research, even the difference between history and not-history, could all be ignored.

From the distrust of Antiquity for mere fiction, that is, stories or anecdotes told without any kind of exemplary purpose, the Middle Ages inherited a serious prejudice against the writing of any long

narrative which was fictive unless it was clearly not verismilar. This view pervades medieval thought from the report that Apollonius of Tyana disallowed fictions that were not obviously *fabulae* to the preoccupations of Boccaccio. In part theorists were afraid of not being able to tell, and of the discrediting effect of suspicion.[27] This contempt for fiction was a given of Western culture well into the period when we would think that novel writing was respectable: novels are full of examples of heroines who rail against the reading of novels. The idea that literature which indulges the fancy is corrupting died hard. To put it simply, imagine a medieval author beginning his story by saying that it was neither true nor authorized: it's an absurdity. The slow development of a self-consciously independent historical mode has been charted by Roberto Weiss,[28] and its application to literary studies is made in *The Better Part of Valor* by Robert Adams.[29] Both these scholars have concentrated on the Humanists. We shall now turn to the late Middle Ages and have a look at the type of book which delighted Ariosto and Dr Johnson, however much it enraged Humanist and neo-Classical theorists.

II

By applying these insights into the rhetorical organization of history established in antiquity, hitherto puzzling attitudes on the part of self-styled "historians" become understandable. Our loss of generic context has encouraged the reading of historical fictions as "inferior romances". The result of the identification of medieval conventions and intentions will be that we cease to criticize these works for being on the one hand unpoetic, flat, and essentially boring, and on the other hand, fantasies which wreak havoc with the facts of the historical past.

I should perhaps stress that I omit annalists and chroniclers from consideration here. Nor will I discuss the problems of chronology for historians whose inherited documents were mainly pagan and had to be accommodated to a historiography which was emphatically Christian, or the extreme importance of consideration of levels or kinds of truth to resolve the conflicting books of the Scriptures which vexed medieval exegetes.[30] There is one important related argument, however, which must be indicated, though it will involve a brief digression.

In the context of Saints' Lives, Martyrologies, and Apocryphal Gospels, something of a double standard of truth was tolerated, and a certain amount of invention was accepted in the creation of exemplary stories in order to encourage the faithful. The writers did their best to avoid terms like "forgery" or "deception" while they "filled in" accounts that were missing. Here we should refer back to the Platonic approval of fictions presented as history where it is a question of inculcating correct moral doctrines among the populace. That writers were in large measure aware of what was being done can be seen in prefaces which indicate a certain self-consciousness. To take three examples: first, there is the preface to one of the Apocryphal Gospels which says, "The truth of this

statement I leave to the author . . . and the faith of the writer; for myself, while pronouncing it doubtful, I do not affirm that it is clearly false."[31] Secondly, the author of an extravagant *Life of St. Gregory* concludes a list of increasingly more implausible miracles by saying that even if these events did not happen, they are true anyway.[32] Thirdly, Petrarch, in the letter to Boccaccio in which he indicates what he has done with the Tale of Griselda, makes a joke about the truth depending on the author, who is, of course, Boccaccio himself.[33] The effects of this widespread manipulation of homiletic and religious material were to provide examples of the rewriting of the sacred past which were obviously important to historians of the profane past.[34] The existence of these accounts must have reinforced the rhetorical and manipulative methods of medieval historians of all kinds.

If no formal medieval discussion of the elements of history exists, the conventions are obvious enough when once one begins to compare historical poems to each other and to prose histories and "biographies". Just as autobiographies have traditionally begun with the subject's antecedents, working up to "I was born", so there are certain set pieces for the writer of history. History begins at the first chronological moment appropriate to what will be narrated; neither with the Creation (as in Universal History or Chronicle) nor *in medias res* (as in Epic). The preface, the analysis of character, speeches, battles, heroic actions, and moments of difficult decision, provide the historian with formal places where he might show his skills. Several of these "set pieces" are considered by Peter Burke in his succinct little book, *The Renaissance Sense of the Past*.[35]

Historical prefaces provide a crucial example, as it is from what the writer says in his preface that we ought to be able to recognize his intention. Prefaces recall how right it is to remember the deeds of men of the past ("Hystoria est res gesta ab etatis nostre memoria remota", as John of Garland put it). While some prefaces simply state this as a given, others remind us that the reasons for remembrance are to preserve the knowledge of whence we came, and to teach us how to govern our conduct. Laȝamon decided, "þat he wolde of Engle þa aeðelaen tellen / wat heo ihoten weoren & wonene heo comen / þa Englene londe aerest ahten."[36] Blind Hary laments that we do not remember often enough: "Our antecessowris that we suld of reide / And hald in mynde thar nobille worthi deid / We lat ourslide throw werray sleuthfulness, / And castis ws euir till vthir besynes."[37] Raoul Lefèvre stresses a commitment to restore his hero's reputation.[38] When authors move from the purposes of history to the citation of sources it is because they are historians with scruples, even though their scruples are different from ours.

To take only one other historical set piece, consider the speech-before-the-battle, when the king (or war leader) addresses his troops. Such speeches really were made, but in medieval historical literature they are the product of the historical imagination. Just as Thucydides gave Pericles the words of the Funeral Oration, so medieval writers delighted in invented oratory, from Einhard's Charlemagne to Thomas More's Richard III. Thomas Wright printed an extract from an early chronicle of London in which we

can discern the alliterative lines in which the poet who was the chronicler's source wrote Henry V's speech before Agincourt.[39] The chronicler gave up turning the poem into prose, so some of the poem survives. If we compare Henry's speech to the ones Froissart or Shakespeare gave him, they are, of course, different. All three are written in more or less the same level, or style of language: the historical. Otherwise they could not have been so easily adapted. Style is a key to meaning.

The question arises: how are we to understand "a verisimilar narration of events which actually happened" if it is clear that certain topoi determine what is worth writing about? And, further, what happens when the demand that certain things are to be written about cannot be satisfied by the memory or the record (such as it is) of what actually happened? As in antiquity, medieval historical writers accepted a certain amount of decoration, of plausible invention. The audience for which a particular historical work was intended may have determined how much a history writer manipulated his material. William of Newburgh's anger with Geoffrey of Monmouth was not that he had "embroidered" or "filled in" the British past, but that he had done it to such an extreme degree - and in Latin. Works explicitly intended for a non-scholarly audience seem to have had more latitude than those meant for scholars. This hypothesis is supported by the various translations (or adaptations) made of Benoît's Troy history. In its original verse form it is "popular history" at its best. Then Guido made something more scholarly of it; his Latin prose pruned Benoît's more obvious extravagances (though not all, since Guido had no external criterion of verification and had to rely largely on common sense and literary judgment), added classical references of his own to indicate his learning, and supplied us with moral reflections upon what was to be learned from the past. Of course modern literary critics found Guido less poetic, less delightful than Benoît.

When the English poets returned Guido's history to the vernacular, they took many of his scholarly reflections out again.[40] But I am convinced that they thought they were preserving the essence of his true account of the past. The substance was reliable even if the accidents were disputable. The line between history and story, so obvious and so important in our modern minds, is so difficult to find in the Middle Ages that one may sometimes despair of finding it at all. Perhaps the search for "a line" is itself mistaken. A brief analogy from our modern experience of reading historical fiction may be illuminating. When we read good novels about historical personages or events (Renault on Alexander, Vidal on Julian, or Yourcenar on Hadrian), our suspension of disbelief is mixed with curiosity mounting to irritation when from time to time during the narrative we begin to wonder if what we are reading is true or not, and are forced to rely only on our own literary judgment. We are at the great advantage (though the novelists may not think so) of being able to compare a given interpretation with historical sources. Sometimes a list of the ones the novelist has used is provided. Modern writers are thus bound by stricter, more learned audiences than were their medieval predecessors, who would certainly have resisted the identification. Yet it may be possible

to isolate more technical terms in medieval "historical fiction" than the three which I have already indicated in discussing the rhetoric of antiquity. Words like *geste* provided certain kinds of "cues" to guide a medieval reader's interpretation of the truth status of what he was reading. But the spectrum of historical writing is very wide, and includes a long period. Two kinds of tangible benefits accrue from an interpretation of medieval historical writing as proceeding from the rhetorical organization of history.

In late medieval France there was a long-lived, and highly influential vogue for histories of the sort which I have been depicting, when many early *chansons de geste* were modernized and turned into prose accounts, and a large number of new histories were written. If we take the latter first, Froissart provides us with a famous example. The *Chronicles* have been called nostalgic and romantic because of their focus on *gestes*, which, far from being a condemnation, is exactly what one would expect of a man who took seriously the two-fold historical task of preserving the deeds of great men and providing an example for the future. Froissart modelled his account according to those set pieces which were standard in his genre: characters of great men, difficult decisions, actions, and especially heroism in battle. Some of his scenes are so beautifully written, so very convincing, that we may not realize how much they conform to literary expectations: indeed, Froissart's own perceptions were no doubt determined by such expectations. The description of the battle of Crécy is a fine example of this. There is little of modern warfare here; his main concern is the behaviour of the great men who were there. Comparison of the successive versions of Froissart's work shows that his changes consistently tended to make his history conform to ideas of what History should be, both in style and content. His latest editor remarks, "Le souci littéraire tend vers un réalisme autre que celui de l'exactitude historique . . . ."[41] In the former category, the *mises en prose*, those books which we call the historical romances, there is a similar moulding of actual recorded events to individual exploits, and from deeds themselves to style and values of behaviour.[42] Their lack of aesthetic appeal has led to neglect by modern literary critics, and their utter unreliability as documents has earned them the scorn of modern historians, but they have a great deal to reveal.

That many of these fifteenth-century writers saw themselves as historians is evident from their prefaces, the form and matter of their books. The large libraries of men like Louis de Bruges, Jean de Wavrin (himself among the most interesting of the writers), Philippe and Charles of Burgundy, were used as we would use research libraries today. From their books authors (some of whom were actually their employees, as it were) modernized and rewrote the old accounts. Jean Wauquelin, Raoul Lefèvre, and David Aubert were three translator/authors of great popularity and influence. The fifties and sixties were a peak time of composition. The method was to follow a major historical outline, rationalize conflicting sources according to ideas of probability and verisimilitude, and glorify the houses of the rich and powerful. In France these

historical romances were turned into prose. In England verse was still being used, although by the late fifteenth century prose was coming into its own at last. The justifying principle was the exemplary value of the past. Caxton was typical when, in his preface to his translation of *The Lyf of the Noble and Crysten Prynce Charles the Grete* he wrote, ". . . the thynges passed dyuersley reduced to remembraunce engendre in vs correction of vnlauful lyf. For the werkes of the auncient and olde peple ben for to gyue to vs ensaumple to lyue in good & vertuous operacions digne & worthy of helth, in folowyng the good and eschewyng the euyl."[43]

It is surely one of the ironies of literary history that the masterpiece of these Burgundian French histories should have been composed in English. The History of Arthur was written at the end of the period in which historical romances belonged to high culture. A generation later the campaign of the Humanists might well have prevented it from ever being written. Indeed, had Caxton not been interested in Burgundian-style narratives, Malory's book might have fallen into the oblivion which was the fate of most of its contemporaries.

Caxton thought of Malory's work as historical, in the sense of "historical" which I have been developing, and he classified the *Morte Darthur* with his two recent histories of Godfrey of Boulogne and of Charlemagne. Malory enabled him to complete a trilogy of books about the Christian worthies, as indeed he points out. With a degree of scepticism, along with a publisher's readiness to encourage his readers to think whatever would redound to the credit of the book, Caxton indicates some of the problems which surrounded the historical existence of Arthur. He leaves the reader to discriminate the good from the evil: this is the exemplar theory, and is a very different thing from making a category distinction about the true and the false. A comparison of Caxton's book and other histories of the period shows immediately that he meant it to be, like them, narrative history. The kinds of editorial work which he did increase this impression, as Professor N.F. Blake has shown.[44] This background of historical writing applies also to the didactic burlesque of *Petit Jehan de Saintré*, which assumes a coherent shape once its relations are recognized.

The gains from a reconsideration of generic boundaries in medieval historical writing are considerable. An increased sense of the complexity and latitude of medieval ways of patterning the past should enable scholars better to weigh the balance between adherence to source and the individual imagination. It should stop us from criticizing long patches of historical poems because they are boringly copied out of books, lack the exciting imagery we expect of "poetry", and seem in many ways tedious and repetitive. Conversely, our awareness of the rights of historians to plausible invention, and our awareness that there were different standards of acceptability for different audiences should stop us from criticizing passages of obvious invention, and should make us wary of dismissing something as "obvious" invention before we have made some rather careful distinctions about invention and tone. It should show us that there might be reasons for the authors of historical poems to use a steady line which does not call attention

to itself. The aa/ax line of the alliterative histories may be the equivalent of Barbour's or Andrew of Wintoun's octosyllabic couplets. There is just no point in blaming a writer for failing to do what he never intended to do. A consideration of the "vague relation" helps us to recover some basic assumptions underlying medieval writers' intentions, which must always be to the good when we are looking at a culture so far removed from us in so many ways. It should send us outward to the vocabulary used for the law, as in Pecok, or for religious persuasion. Finally, as ever, an awareness of what the important questions were for the Middle Ages helps us to see to what subsequent generations reacted, to recognize continuities which extend into the seventeenth century and beyond.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A draft of this article was originally read at the Graduate Medieval Seminar of University College, London. I am grateful to Dr Stefan Collini, Professor Roger Ray, and Professor Arthur Sherbo for their comments and advice.

NOTES

1 "Historical Fiction in Fifteenth Century Burgundy", *MLR* 75 (1980) pp.48-64. An analysis of a single historical romance will appear in *MLR* 78 (1983).

2 *Epic and Romance: Essays on Medieval Literature* (London, 1908) p.4.

3 *Morte Arthure* (London, 1967) esp. pp.3-11, where Professor Finlayson replaces Epic with *Chanson de geste*, one of the three "classes" of Ker's Epic. See Ker, *Epic and Romance*, p.6.

4 Moses Finley, *The Ancient Greeks* (Harmondsworth, 1966) p.114.

5 *The Language of History in the Renaissance* (Princeton, 1970) p.24. Historians were not always inhibited by their education: fear also played a part. Sidonius Apollinaris declined to write history because "to tell lies is disgraceful; to tell the truth dangerous". (*Poems and Letters*, ed. and trans. W.B. Anderson (Cambridge, Mass., 1965) p.148.)

6 *De Duplici Copia verborum ac rerum* (3rd ed. [with Erasmus's final revisions] Basel, 1540) pp.323-4: "Ad hanc formam praecipue pertinet schema Διαλογισμός, id est, sermocinatio, quoties uniquique sermonem accommodamus, aetati, generi, patriae, uitae [,] instituto, animo, moribusque congruentem. Nam huiusmodi sermones in historia licet affingere. Vnde tot Thucydidis, Salustii, Liuii, orationes effinguntur & epistolae & apophthegmata. Demum & cogitationes, ueluti hominis secum loquentis, quanquam hoc poëtis familiarius". See also Janet A. Fairweather, "Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers", *Ancient Society* 5 (1974) pp.231-75.

7 The problem is frequently referred to, e.g. Aristotle, *Poetics* 9.1451b, esp. on Epic 23.1459b; Cicero, *De Legibus* 1.1.4 and *Ad Familiares* 5.12.3; Horace, *Ars Poetria*, e.g. 119ff; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 10. See also Pierre Grimal, "Le poète et l'histoire", *Entretiens Hardt* 15 (1968) pp.51-106 and discussion pp.108-17; F.W. Walbank, "Speeches in Greek Historians", The Third J.L. Myres Memorial Lecture (Oxford, n.d.).

8 See Arnaldo Momigliano, "The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography", reprinted in his *Studies in Historiography* (New York, 1966) pp.127-42. The passage from Cicero is from *De Legibus* 1.1.5.

9 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *The Three Literary Letters*, ed. and trans. W. Rhys Roberts (Cambridge, 1901) pp.88-127.

10 On the exemplar theory from the mid-sixteenth to the mid-eighteenth centuries see George A. Nadel, "Philosophy of History before Historicism", *History and Theory* 4 (1964) pp.291-315.

[11] *The Histories*, ed. and trans. W.R. Paton (Cambridge, Mass., 1922) I.1.

[12] J.H. Hexter, "The Education of the Aristocracy in the Renaissance", in his *Reappraisals in History* (London, 1961) pp.45-70.

[13] See, for a convenient survey, the notes to Geoffrey Shepherd's edition of Sidney's *An Apology for Poetry* (London, 1965), e.g. notes to p.96, pp.145-6.

[14] Euripides, *Medea*, ed. Sir Denys Page (Oxford, 1938) pp.xxi-xxx.

[15] While I do not think that I would want to stress the moral content of either work, such a case has been made by Robert M. Lumiansky, "Dares' *Historia* and Dictys' *Ephemeris*: a critical comment", in *Studies in Language, Literature, and Culture of the Middle Ages and Later*, ed. E. Bagby Atwood and Archibald A. Hill (Austin, 1969) pp.200-9. The kind of "moral purpose" which Professor Lumiansky sees in Dictys' distribution of praise and blame (p.205) is intrinsic to a historical narrative and not a sign of literary quality.

[16] Quoted by Ben Edwin Perry, *The Ancient Romances* (Berkeley, 1967) p.78; from L'Empereur Julien, *Oeuvres Complètes*, ed. J. Bidez (Paris, 1924) Epist. 89.301b, where Julian seems to want to protect philosophers from the emotions which such works arouse.

[17] This becomes a key problem for Humanist theorists like Scaliger and Sidney.

[18] *Les Arts poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1924). The collections printed by Carolus Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores* (Leipzig, 1863) provide a wide range of rhetorical handbooks.

[19] The best recent guide is James J. Murphy, *Medieval Rhetoric: A Select Bibliography* (Toronto, 1970).

[20] Charles Sears Baldwin, *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (to 1400)* (N.Y., 1928; repr. Gloucester, Mass., 1959) and J.W.H. Atkins, *English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase* (Cambridge, 1943). Again, part of the problem with these early critics is that they approached medieval literature in terms of modern category distinctions like "epic" and "romance".

[21] This issue is raised by Luis Castro in his unpublished doctoral dissertation, *The Idea of the Fact in English Law* (Cambridge, 1976). See *Novum Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis* (Munksgaard, 1959-) s.v. "narratio".

[22] Texts in Halm, *Rhetores*. For Boccaccio see *Genealogia Deorum Gentilium Libri*, ed. Vincenzo Romano, 2 vols. (Bari, 1951). C.G. Osgood's translation of the theoretical books, *Boccaccio on Poetry* (New York, 1930) is marred by his use of modern literary terms, so that distinctions in the original are obscured.

[23] John of Garland, *Poetria Parisiana*, ed. T. Lawler (New Haven, 1974); Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria Nova*, ed. Faral, *Arts Poétiques*; also Vincent of Beauvais, quoted by C.S. Baldwin, *Medieval Rhetoric*, pp.174-6.

[24] For these historical topoi see Peter Burke, *The Renaissance Sense of the Past* (London, 1969). *Encomium Emmae Reginae* (ed. Alistair Campbell

(London, 1949) I.4) contains an extended *descriptio* of a navy which owes much to classical precedent.

[25] Quoted from *Justin, Cornelius Nepos, and Eutropius*, trans. J.S. Watson (London, 1897) pp.255-6 (Book 37.3). Justin's *Epitome* was among the books important enough to be translated by Arthur Goldyng (1564), and was frequently recommended as educative reading by medieval and renaissance writers, including Antoine de la Sale.

[26] *Li Fet des Romains: compilé ensemble de Saluste et de Suetoine et de Lucan*, ed. L.-F. Flutre and K. Sneyders de Vogel, 2 vols. (Paris, 1937-8); printed by A. Vérard as *Lucan, Suetoine, et Saluste en françois* (Paris, 1490, 1500). See Paul Meyer, "Les Premières compilations françaises d'histoire ancienne", *Romania* 14 (1885) pp.1-81. I do not wish to argue that all medieval historians deliberately modelled their writing on *particular* classical texts, but that the surviving Roman histories were important as a group. Einhard's *Vita Caroli* followed Suetonius and Sidonius, and the anonymous author of the *Encomium Emmae Reginae* consulted such models of historical writing as Virgil, Lucan, and especially Sallust. I am at present writing a book-length study of the problems raised here.

[27] Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, ed. and trans. F.C. Conybeare, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1912) V.14. See also *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, p.5: "For when in writing the deeds of any one man one inserts a fictitious element, either in error, or, as is often the case, for the sake of ornament, the hearer assuredly regards facts as fictions, when he has ascertained the introduction of so much as one lie!"

[28] *The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity* (Oxford, 1969).

[29] *The Better Part of Valor: More, Erasmus, Colet, and Vives on Humanism, War, and Peace, 1496-1535* (Seattle, 1962).

[30] On these problems see Roger Ray, "Bede, the Exegete, as Historian", in *Famulus Christi: Essays in Honor of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede* (London, 1976); Nancy F. Partner, *Serious Entertainments* (Chicago, 1977); Paule Démats, *Fabula* (Geneva, 1973).

[31] *The Apocryphal New Testament*, trans. M.R. James (Oxford, 1953) p.72. This is quoted by William Nelson in *Fact or Fiction: the Dilemma of the Renaissance Storyteller* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973) p.21. See also Roger Ray, "Bede's *Vera Lex Historiae*", *Speculum* 55 (1980) pp.1-21.

[32] *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great: by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby*, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave (Lawrence, Kansas, 1968) pp.128-35. I owe this reference to Dr Peter Godman.

[33] J. Burke Severs, *The Literary Relationships of Chaucer's Clerkes Tale* (New Haven, 1942) pp.291-2. "Quisquis ex me queret an hec vera sint, hoc est an historiam scripserim an fabulam, respondebo illud Crispi: 'Fides penes auctorem (meum scilicet Johannem) sit'"; from *Letteres Seniles* 17.3.

[34] See H. Delehaye, *Les Légendes hagiographiques*, 3rd ed. (Brussels, 1927); S.C. Aston, "The Saint in Medieval Literature", *MLR* 65 (1970) pp.xxv-xlii.

[35] How long-lived the conventions of the historical preface were may be seen by sampling the collections edited by Bernard Weinberg, *Critical Prefaces of the French Renaissance* (Evanston, 1950); and Ioan Williams, *Novel and Romance 1700-1800: A Documentary Record* (London, 1970).

[36] Laȝamon, *Brut*, ed. G.L. Brook and R.F. Leslie, EETS OS 250 (London, 1963), Caligula MS, ll.6-8.

[37] *Hary's Wallace*, ed. M.P. McDiarmid, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1968-9) ll.1-6.

[38] *L'Histoire de Jason*, ed. G. Pinkernell (Frankfurt, 1971).

[39] *Political Poems and Songs*, Rolls Series, 2 vols. (London, 1859-61) II, pp.123-7.

[40] C. David Benson, *The History of Troy in Middle English Literature: Guido delle Colonne's 'Historia Destructionis Troiae' in Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 1980).

[41] Froissart, *Chroniques*, ed. George T. Diller, Textes Littéraires Français 194 (Geneva, 1972) pp.23-4. So also R.W. Southern: "The presentation of great and noble events in language appropriate to the subject-matter, and the moulding of this subject-matter into artistically contrived patterns, which emphasized grandeur and relegated pettiness to oblivion, became a major preoccupation of a long line of historians". ("Some Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 20 (1970) p.180.)

[42] They are conveniently listed in Brian Woledge's *Bibliographie des romans et nouvelles en prose française antérieurs a 1500* (Geneva, 1954) and *Supplément 1954-1973* (Geneva, 1975).

[43] Ed. S.J.H. Herrtage, EETS ES 37 (London, 1881) p.l. See also, Robert Guiette, "Chanson de geste, chronique, et mise en prose" in his *Forme et Senefiance: études médiévales* (Geneva, 1978) pp.135-62.

[44] *Caxton and his World* (London, 1969) pp.108-13. See also Larry D. Benson, *Malory's Morte Darthur* (Cambridge, Mass., 1976).

WYATT AND CHAUCER: A RE-APPRAISAL

By HELEN COOPER

The outlines of almost all future Wyatt criticism were laid down in the sixteenth century. Surrey, in his famous epitaph on Wyatt, declared that he "Reft Chaucer the glorie of his wytte". Another contemporary admirer, John Leland, wrote a series of Latin elegies celebrating Wyatt's achievements in refining the English language to the point where his poetry could bear comparison with that of the Italians. In 1589, in the *Arte of English Poesie*, Puttenham described the descent of the Chaucerian tradition through Lydgate to Skelton, and contrasted the poets of that tradition with the "new company of courtly makers"

> who hauing trauailed into Italie, and there tasted the sweete and stately measures and stile of the Italian Poesie as nouices newly crept out of the schooles of *Dante Arioste* and *Petrarch*, they greatly pollished our rude & homely maner of vulgar Poesie, from that it had bene before, and for that cause may iustly be sayd the first reformers of our English meetre and stile.[1]

Those first generations of critics, in other words, were concerned with placing Wyatt in the context of poetic traditions and influences, especially Chaucer and the Italians, and they saw his achievement in that context as one which gave a new direction to English poetry. These concerns have remained central to studies of Wyatt, and the leading names of the last two or three decades of Wyatt criticism - H.A. Mason, John Stevens, Kenneth Muir, Patricia Thomson, Raymond Southall and others - have been above all occupied with establishing Wyatt's place in a historical, social and literary context.[2] His debts to Chaucer and the Italians, especially Petrarch, have been emphasised, questioned and re-examined, and his close affinities with the English courtly lyric of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries have been stressed to a degree that calls into doubt the earliest critics' estimates of the new direction he gave English poetry.

What this discussion has not always achieved, excellent and stimulating as so much of it is, is an estimate of Wyatt's qualities in themselves.[3] The very difficulty of defining these perhaps points to certain distinctive characteristics of Wyatt's poetry that are not found in the works that make up his literary context - profundity that is expressed through an at times extreme linguistic simplicity, and simplicity that is never naïve. For all the

extensive resemblances to courtly lyric in general - resemblances that at times amount to near-identity, so that disentangling Wyatt's own poems from the work of his contemporaries can sometimes be impossible - most of Wyatt's work is completely amenable to the techniques of critical appreciation in a way that earlier poetry of an apparently similar kind is not. Only one of his poems, the superb "They fle from me that sometyme did me seke" (XXXVII), is consistently read with such direct poetic commitment; but it is possible to do it for a great many more. It may be the very lack of any known source or obvious relatives[4] that encourages this approach to "They fle from me", but that lack is true too of a good many of the poems of Wyatt that have received the most general critical acclaim, as well as of a large number of minor lyrics. Wyatt is generally no more - if no less - dependent on sources and influences than any other significant English writer before the eighteenth-century invention of originality. Source studies alone can no more get to the heart of Wyatt's achievement than to Chaucer's or Shakespeare's. My own aim now is not to establish more, or less, evidence of influence, but to use Chaucer as a foil for Wyatt, to define Wyatt's poetic by comparison with Chaucer's, for the similarities and differences between the two are often very strikingly precise.

The comparison holds good for both style and theme. That Wyatt is the first English poet who can bear comparison with Chaucer - or even, as Surrey suggests, on his own ground surpass Chaucer - emerges from any reading of fifteenth and early sixteenth century poetry. To find again the racy colloquialism of

> "Wel bourded," quod the doke, "by myn hat!"

or the aphoristic succinctness of

> Trouthe is the hyest thyng that man may kepe,

or the sharp use of apothegm,

> Stryve not, as doth the crokke with the wal,[5]

then one has to turn straight from Chaucer to Wyatt: to

> Ye old mule that thinck your self so fayre, (XXXV.1)

or

> Content the then with honest pouertie, (CVII.86)

or

> A chippe of chaunce more then a pownde of witt. (CV.79)

Wyatt is not necessarily deliberately following in Chaucer's tracks here: analogous lines could be found in almost any later good writer. It is rather that he rediscovers the power of directness of language for a multiplicity of effects, a use of language for which Chaucer then provided the best model. Intervening generations of Chaucerians

had largely ignored this directness, preferring the linguistic indirectness of aureate language, also learnt from Chaucer but used with none of his balance and discretion. Even the verse form with the most distinctively Chaucerian hallmark, rhyme royal, recovers its immediacy and flexibility in Wyatt's hands,[6] and when Wyatt is using it for purposes similar to Chaucer's their poetic is strikingly close. A stanza from Hawes set beside one from Chaucer and another from Wyatt exemplifies the major poets' common grasp of powerful language against the ugly rhythms, obese vocabulary and clumsy syntax of the post-Lydgate tradition. Here is Hawes, the most directly "Chaucerian" of the poets at court when Wyatt made his entry there, writing in the *Pastime of Pleasure* of 1509, on the degeneration of the present as against "olde antyquyte":

> So do they now, for they nothynge prepence
> How cruell dethe dothe them sore ensue:
> They are so blynded in worldly neclygence
> That to theyr meryte they wyll nothynge renewe
> The seuen scyences, theyr slouthe to eschewe.
> To an oders profyte they take now no kepe,
> But to theyr owne, for to ete, drynke and slepe.[7]

Here is Chaucer in the *balade* of *Gentilesse*, writing with a similar moral and didactic purpose:

> Vyce may wel be heir to old richesse;
> But ther may no man, as men may wel see,
> Bequethe his heir his vertuous noblesse
> (That is appropred unto no degree
> But to the firste fader in magestee,
> That maketh hem his heyres that him queme),
> Al were he mytre, croune or diademe. (15-21)

The same poetic authority and rhythmic sureness is to be heard in this verse from Wyatt's "If thou wilt mighty be", a reworking of part of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*:

> If to be noble and high thy minde be meued
> Consider well thy grounde and thy beginnyng,
> For he that hath eche starre in heauen fixed,
> And geues the Moone her hornes and her eclipsyng:
> Alike hath made the noble in his workyng,
> So that wretched no way thou may bee
> Except foule lust and vice do conquere thee.[8]

Wyatt and Chaucer make the verse form work for them in a smoothly integrated syntactic unit with a climax of meaning clearly marked by the grammatical and rhythmic structure of the stanza; Hawes is struggling with a language and rhyme scheme that always get the better of him. Hawes sticks at the level of platitude; Chaucer and Wyatt can turn truism into truth.

It is perhaps worth emphasising that what Wyatt and Chaucer have in common is this high quality of poetic, since studies of the resemblances of phrasing between the two have tended to stress

their common fund of conventions, even clichés[9] - to stress their similarity in their least characteristically individual and often their slightest writings, in fact. On that reading, Chaucer could be presented as a malign influence preventing Wyatt from achieving his best, just as the earlier poet's elaboration of language could be held to be a malign influence on the poetry of the fifteenth century. The sense of poetic continuity between them rarely depends on specific imitation; only a few of Wyatt's verbal borrowings from Chaucer are significant, and they do not add up to making Wyatt a Chaucerian.[10] Although he knows the major works, the most striking borrowings are from some of Chaucer's short moral poems, the *balades* *Truth* and *Fortune*.

The direct similarities between the two poets are limited by the very obvious fact that they usually write very different kinds of poetry. Chaucer's poems are most often long, based on a narrative structure of sequential event, and his own typical rôle within his poems is as narrator or spectator, or both. His poems presuppose an audience, with himself as the medium for bringing his listeners into contact with his story. Wyatt approaches most nearly to this kind of poetry when he withdraws altogether from being a first-person presence within the poem and turns his attention outwards, as authoritative speaker rather than as actor. This happens in the Boethian "If thou wilt mighty be, flee from the rage / Of cruell wyll", where, as in Chaucer's *Truth*, "Flee fro the prees", the imperatives imply less a narrator than an authoritative voice addressing an audience; or again in the *Penitential Psalms*, the linking sections of which are among the most consistently Chaucerian in style of anything Wyatt ever wrote, though this time the model is more *Troilus and Criseyde* than the *balades*. The links between the psalms are partly narrative and partly descriptive of David's state and circumstances, observed sympathetically but from outside, in very much the same mixture as Chaucer uses for the presentation of Troilus and his long love-laments. David's spiritual desolation is not so far distant from Troilus' emotional desolation, and the falling together of theme encourages a falling together of style, even to the imitation of vocabulary and imagery:

> His hete, his lust and plesur all in fere
> Consume and wast . . . . (CVIII.45-6)

> But who had bene withowt the Cavis mowth,
> And herd the terys and syghes that he did strayne,
> He wold have sworne there had owt off the sowth
> A lewk warme wynd browght forth a smoky rayne. (411-4)

Wyatt is here setting out, as Chaucer often does, to engage his readers' sympathy through overt rhetorical devices: it is an engagement that has to be achieved through the emotional appeal of rhetoric rather than the emotional appeal of a victim because the poet has withdrawn from being an actor in the narrative of the poem.

If this is one aspect of Wyatt's poetry, it is certainly not the most typical. Almost everywhere outside the *Psalms* and a handful of other poems, Wyatt is not the narrator or the observer but

the protagonist of his own poems, in a dramatic rather than biographical sense. If Chaucer, as the overt mediator of all he writes, never lets events speak for themselves, Wyatt never lets events speak at all: he does all the talking himself. Love-laments and outbursts against Fortune are not *recorded*, as they are for Troilus or Palamon and Arcite, but spoken in the first person with no mitigation or qualification from any context:

> Fortune and you did me avaunce;
> Me thought I swam and could not drowne,
> Happiest of all, but my myschaunce
> Did lyft me vp to throwe me downe. (LIII.25-8)

The emphasis therefore moves from narrative, external event, to state of mind, and the structural organization is not that of sequential action but the movement of mind of the poem's "I". What the mind is responding to is less likely to be another person or an episode than a moral abstraction: Fortune, "doubleness", truth - although this last quality, though it echoes throughout Wyatt's poems, is most often noted for its absence. The experience at the heart of almost all Wyatt's verse is mutability, and he responds as both a sufferer and a moral being. The closeness of Wyatt to the Metaphysical poets has often been remarked; but if Donne does not dissociate passion and intellect, Wyatt does not dissociate emotion and deep moral idealism, usually frustrated. Even in his love-poems, the ultimate object of his desire is not a lady, or her reciprocated love, but stability, "truth".

The pervasiveness of these qualities in Wyatt shows up the inadequacy of any response to his poetry in terms of the conventions of courtly lyric, or even of Petrarchism. It is true that Petrarch can provide a model for the inwardness of Wyatt's poetry, but Petrarch in his love-poems is inseparable from Laura; in Wyatt's poems, the women (and the plural is important) have almost no physical existence. The lady's looks, which provide the staple of so many courtly and Petrarchan lyrics, scarcely get a mention in Wyatt; his one reference to golden hair makes the only bad line in a gem of a poem contrasting inner and outer beauty.[11] His women hardly ever speak: the one long speech he gives, in "There was never nothing more me payned" (XXXVIII), is enclosed structurally and emotionally by the intensity of his own response to it. Outward event is disallowed along with other people: if there is any action, it is hinted at obliquely through reaction alone. One of his few poems specifically put into the mouth of someone else, the lament of a betrayed girl, indicates that she is pregnant only through the lines,

> Now may I karke and care
> To syng lullay by by. (CLXXXI.3-4)

Even the poems most often read as autobiographical display the same qualities of abstraction and lack of explicit context, so that historical reference remains a peripheral speculation.

Above all, Wyatt is far removed from Petrarchan and courtly

traditions because the situation that provides the staple for those, the courtship of a resisting lady, is never central to his work. He is less a love poet than a poet of betrayal; the ladies of his poems are cruel, not because they will not give in to him, but because they have given in to someone else. The distance of this theme from the usual conventions is indicated by the small number of such poems of his that have any known source.[12] The subjects to which he always returns are faithlessness, change and mutability. That is why, given his habit of grappling with abstractions rather than situations, his political poems and his "love" poems are so close to each other in subject, phrasing and mood. Sometimes the two kinds are virtually interchangeable: "Like as the byrde in the cage enclosed" (CCXLVI) is an attempt to balance up

> Wyche shuld be best by determination,
> By losse off liefe libertye, or liefe by preson. (6-7)

In the last stanza he appeals to "yowe louers" to decide the question for him, so making the issue of death versus imprisonment overtly metaphorical; but the strength with which the question has been debated calls the metaphorical reading into doubt:

> By leynght off liefe yet shulde I suffer,
> Adwayting time and fortunes chaunce;
> Manye thinges happen within an hower;
> That wyche me oppressed may me avaunce;
> In time is trust wyche by deathes greuaaunce
> Is vtterlye lost. (15-20)

Commonplace as the thoughts may be, these lines have all the intensity one could expect from a writer with Wyatt's bitter experience of imprisonment and the threat of execution; but the argument advances on both sides at once - life would bring the suffering of uncertainty and also the hope of improvement,

> But deathe were deliueraunce and liefe lengthe off payne. (21)

The poem ends with an appeal for a "playne conclusyon", but it is very far from reaching one. In form the poem is modelled on the *balade* of rhyme royal stanzas, even to the "envoy" verse with its appeal to the audience; but the refrain line serves as a fixed point only in the sense that it contains the opposition of contraries out of which the poem is constructed:

> By losse off liefe libertye or liefe by preson.

Where Chaucer's *balade* refrains establish the moral certainty of his poems - "Trouthe thee shal delivere, it is no drede"[13] - the repetition of Wyatt's line only serves to emphasise the insolubility of the problem. As so often in his poetry the uncertain rhythms, the counterpointing of iambic pentameters with lines that fall apart in the middle, mirror the instability of the subject - he uses such rhythms above all for lines about getting lost, falling, stumbling,

wavering, or, as here, hesitating.[14] "Like as the byrde" may be a poem about the thralldom of love; but that is one of the least notable things about it. It is a poem about the impossibility of finding certainty in an uncertain world, whatever the context. Its modelling on the *balade* form is itself misleading, for in its relentless re-treading of the same series of questions it finishes up in some respects closer to Beckett than Chaucer.

The opposition of contraries is one of Wyatt's recurrent themes, and perhaps one of the major reasons for his attraction to Petrarch. Its rhetorical form, the paradox, which Petrarch exploited so widely, is most commonly used as a means of exciting wonder or bewilderment, and those are precisely the reactions that Petrarch is concerned to elicit in response to love. One of the *Rime* that Wyatt chose to translate consists almost entirely of such paradoxes, "Pace non trovo e non ho da far guerra", "I fynde no peace and all my warr is done".[15] Beyond the effect of such rhetoric on the reader, the opposition of contraries is used to mirror a state of mind, as in the one poem of the *Rime* that Chaucer translated, in *Troilus and Criseyde*, "If no love is, O God, what fele I so?":

> Thus possed to and fro,
> Al sterelees withinne a boot am I
> Amydde the see, bitwixen wyndes two,
> That in contrarie stonden evere mo.[16]

It is a measure of how far such direct portrayal of emotion is from most of what Chaucer writes that he gives this song a separate heading, *Canticus Troili*, as he never does with Troilus' hymns to love elsewhere in the poem, even when they are inset translations or adaptations. Everywhere else Troilus is addressing something outside himself - Criseyde (whether she is physically present or not), or Fortune, or the breaking day, or Venus; but the "O God" of the first line of the *Canticus* is more of an exclamation than a prayer, and the rest of the poem is introspective and self-analytical - and inconclusive - in a way that Troilus never approaches elsewhere. This poem has to be put into Troilus' own mouth, and not serve the narrator as a disquisition on love, for the "I" is inseparable from the thoughts and feelings being expressed. Petrarch's "I", like Wyatt's, is the protagonist, not the observer; and so there is no fixed point, no possibility for detachment. It follows for Petrarch, and therefore for Troilus here, that there is no possibility for irony: Petrarchan love-poetry offers an analysis of emotion so intense and all-consuming as to forbid the lover to stand back from his poem. Poet and lover are fused and inseparable; and the Petrarchan "I" who is the lover is therefore also the poet straining to find ways of expressing those extremes of emotion.

Some of these characteristics are adopted whole by Wyatt, and not only in his directly Petrarchan poems. "It may be good" (XXI) has no known source, but the oppositions, and the intensity, are just as striking:

> Alas! I tred an endles maze
> That seketh to accorde two contraries;

> And hope still, and nothing hase,
> Imprisoned in libertes,
> As oon unhard and still that cries;
> Alwaies thursty and yet nothing I tast:
> For dred to fall I stond not fast. (8-14)

The "contraries", for Wyatt, are not only a rhetorical means of expressing emotion or engaging the reader, but are at the heart of the instability that provides the central theme of most of his poetry. Truth, reality, if it exists, exists somewhere between or beyond the two opposed points, but it is never apprehensible, whether the "contraries" are in the outside world (as rarely happens), or are emotional or moral. The only thing one can apparently be sure of is deceit:

> Yet this trust I have of full great aperaunce:
> Syns that decept is ay retourneable
> Of very force it is aggreable;
> That therewithall be done the recompence.
> Then gile begiled plained should be never
> And the reward litle trust for ever. (XVI.9-14)

The contrast in the usage of "trust" in the first and last lines of that quotation is itself used to show up the speciousness of the security offered at first. Trust in deceit means an everlasting state of trustlessness.

The very deliberateness with which Wyatt plays off the terms of his "contraries", however, can lend his poems one quality that Petrarch notably lacks: irony, a distance between the point of view from which the poem is written and of the I-protagonist within the poem. Chaucer is of course supremely skilful at this, but it is exceptional in his work to find that ironist and victim are one and the same: the roundel "Sin I fro Love escaped am so fat"[17] is perhaps the closest instance, but there the process is more one of the speaker's thumbing his nose at love than the self-irony that the identity of speaker and victim suggests. Wyatt can brilliantly convey both the intensity of passion and the ironic detachment of the onlooker. "In eternum", for instance, describes his progress into and out of an amorous entanglement, yet eternally repeated disappointment is not going to stop him making the same fool of himself all over again: he concludes,

> In eternum than from my hert I keste
> That I had furst determind for the best;
> Now in the place another thought doeth rest
> In eternum. (LXXI.19-24)

The whole action, characteristically, is played out in the speaker's mind, to the almost total exclusion of the lady. He sets out to look for "the *thing* that I myght like";[18] and even after he has found her, that she is other than an object is indicated only through three possessive adjectives - *her* heart, *her* grace, *her* heart. This refusal to acknowledge any mutuality in love (quite apart from the fact that she is herself unfaithful), and the wryness

of that last verse, suggest a flippancy of tone that the poem as a whole does not quite support. Like so many of Wyatt's poems, it takes its point of departure from an ideal of integrity and stability, the ideal at once affirmed and mocked in the refrain words. It is about how

> as me thought my trowghthe had taken place
> With full assurans to stond in her grace, (14-15)

and how the search for truth, assurance, faith, is eternally baffled.

Wyatt rarely breaks the moral abstraction of the terms in which he writes except to give in simile or metaphor from the physical world the corollary to this state of trustlessness. Any reader will notice immediately the consistency of his dominant imagery: imagery of water, wind and weather, sparks, uncertainty, changeableness and speciousness of every kind - "the ferme faith that in the water fleteth", "me lusteth no lenger rotten boughes to clyme"; even the words of a poem will only "sparkill in the wynde".[19] This kind of image, when it occurs in a source poem, is faithfully kept or elaborated: ploughing in the water (XIV.14, from Serafino), "the slipper toppe / Of courtes estate" (CCXL.1-2, from Seneca), Petrarch's metaphors of the sea. In one of these the statutory "rok in the salte floode" promises neither the certainty of shipwreck nor a refuge from the surge: it is a magnetic rock

> That drawithe the yron from the woode
> And levithe the shippe vnsure.[20]

If his sources do not offer such imagery he will often add it, whether the poem is a free adaptation - Petrarch's "Una candida cerva" offers nothing resembling "Sithens in a nett I seke to hold the wynde" (VII.8)[21] - or whether he is otherwise keeping close to his original, as in "The longe love". Here a different image of disorientation makes its appearance: the forest. Love is put to flight by the lady,

> Wherewithall, vnto the hertes forrest he fleith,
> Leving his enterprise with payne and cry.

The equivalent first line in Petrarch reads simply,

> Onde Amor paventoso fugge al core.[22]

In this poem again the lover is caught between contraries - Love, presented as a war-lord, and the lady who puts him to flight; and the lover himself is in the middle, self-divided. That self-division reveals in Wyatt's poem something more inward, and more startling, than Petrarch will admit: that image of the "hertes forrest". The phrase evokes a sense of the dark places of the spirit such as had rarely been touched on in previous English poetry: in Chaucer's darkest moments his heroes may find themselves pitted against Fortune or the gods, but never face to face with that

sense of inner bewilderment and confusion. The image of the forest, ubiquitous in so much mediaeval poetry, is indeed almost conspicuous by its absence in Chaucer's. Wyatt's most powerful evocation of such a state comes in another addition to a translation, in "Stond who so list", where the original chorus of Seneca offers nothing resembling Wyatt's image of inward horror:

> For hym death greep'the right hard by the croppe
> That is moche knowen of other, and of him self alas,
> Doth dye vnknowen, dazed with dreadfull face.
> (CCXL.8-10)

The terrible particularity of that is a world away from Seneca's lines, which have all the sense of commonplace appropriate to their choric function:

> Illi mors gravis incubat,
> Qui notus nimis omnibus
> Ignotus moritur sibi.[23]

Even the most closely comparable lines from Chaucer, Arcite's dying speech, have something of the same quality of choric generalization:

> What is this world? what asketh men to have?
> Now with his love, now in his colde grave
> Allone, withouten any compaignye. (KnT 2777-9)

Chaucer is concerned with the position of man in a hostilely ordered universe; in Wyatt what matters is the possibility - or impossibility - of self-knowledge, and the inner abyss that death can reveal with unique and horrible clarity: "dazed, with dreadfull face".

The two poets show something of the same contrast in their presentation of virtue and steadfastness. Wyatt stresses inward integrity and self-sufficiency; Chaucer's ideal is more of a stable mind in an ordered society. Even when Chaucer seems to be asserting a more individual morality, the movement of his poetry takes it back from the personal to the universal. The "trouthe" that he advocates in the *Franklin's Tale* is integrity expressed in a pact, a social bond; in the *balade* of *Truth*, the quality is not only one of self-sufficiency and self-mastery - "Suffyce unto thy good", "Reule wel thyself" - but is guaranteed by God. The poem is an injunction to turn from the "prees" not just inward, but to God; to know, not just one's self, but one's "contree" in Heaven as against the wilderness of earth.[24]

The whole concept of "truth", whether the "sothfastnesse" of Chaucer's *balade* or the truth of the heart in personal relationships, is crucial to Wyatt. The word echoes through all his poetry on whatever subject. He stresses its importance discursively in his famous letters of advice to his son:

I haue nothing to crye and cal apon you for but honestye, honestye . . .

Here I call not honestye that men comenly cal honestye, as reputation for riches, for authoritie, or some like thing, but . . . wisdome, gentlenes, sobrenes, disire to do good, frendlines to get the love of manye, and trougth above all the rest.[25]

Even though the context here refers to social behaviour, Wyatt's emphasis is still to reject the outward forms in favour of an inner integrity. That Surrey picks out exactly the same characteristic in his elegy on Wyatt -

A hart, where drede was never so imprest
To hyde the thought that might the trouth avance

- suggests, despite the laudatory nature of obituaries, that it was an ideal Wyatt achieved in his own life.

In Wyatt's love-poems, "truth" means integrity expressed in faithfulness - or rather, almost always, lack of truth shown in disloyalty means an insecurity of identity or integrity:

For fansy at his lust
Doeth rule all but by gesse;
Whereto should I then trust
In trouth or stedfastnes? (XLII.17-20)

In his satires or his poems on politics and court life, his usages of the word or the concept are often strikingly close to Chaucer's formulation in "Flee fro the prees". His third satire, "A spending hand", reads like the *balade* turned inside out. Chaucer sees the "prees" of people thronging for worldly success as opposed to "sothfastnesse". Wyatt sees the same opposition, but he offers a satirically cynical solution:

Thou knowest well first who so can seke to plese
Shall purchase frendes where trowght shall but offend.
Fle therefore trueth. (CVII.32-4)

His second satire, "My mothers maydes", is written without that distortion of viewpoint, and in it he advocates a Boethian - or Chaucerian - morality with no intervening irony. The poem works round, by way of one of the best versions of the fable of the town mouse and the country mouse ever written, to an advocacy of inner self-sufficiency. He rejects the pursuit of false felicity, of unstable, and therefore illusory, earthly happiness, as Arcite does in the *Knight's Tale*:

We seken faste after felicitee,
But we goon wrong ful often, trewely. (KnT 1266-7)

How men do seke the best
And fynde the wourst by errour as they stray! (CVI.70-1)

Chaucer gives the positive side of this in *Truth* - "suffyce unto thy good", "savour no more than thee bihove shal"; Wyatt urges the same principles:

> Thy self content with that is the assigned
> And vse it well that is to the allotted. (CVI.95-6)

But this is a quiet of mind to be achieved not, as in Chaucer, through God, but through a more Boethian inner certainty:

> Then seke no more owte of thy self to fynde
> The thing that thou haist sought so long before,
> For thou shalt fele it sitting in thy mynde. (97-9)

Only in the *Penitential Psalms*, among the most public of Wyatt's poems, does he give this inner strength an overtly religious dimension, in his paraphrase of Psalm 51 - the psalm on Wyatt's favourite topic, the rejection of "the owtward dedes that owtward men disclose" in favour of the feelings of the heart and spirit. The Psalmist's prayer, "Benigne fac, Domine, in bona voluntate tua Sion: ut aedificentur muri Jerusalem" (v.18), becomes in Wyatt an image the opposite of the heart's forest - an image of inner blessedness, not disorientation:

> Make Syon, lord, accordyng to thy will,
> Inward Syon, the Syon of the ghost:
> Off hertes Hierusalem strength the walles still.[26]

Wyatt's most fully Boethian poem, "If thou wilt mighty be", may be taken from the *De Consolatione* itself rather than Chaucer's *Boece*, but it is modelled on Chaucer in other more significant ways. In his choice of rhyme royal for its form, and in the emphatic imperative "Flee -", where both Boethius and Chaucer use a subjunctive, Wyatt brings it strikingly close to *Truth*:[27]

> If thou wilt mighty be, flee from the rage
> Of cruell wyll . . . (CCLXI.1-2)

In this poem Wyatt breaks away from the relentless inwardness of most of his poetry, and a reference to his sources shows why. The metres he is adapting are spoken not by the victim philosopher but by Philosophy herself, the figure who has all the answers and is standing apart from the rolling wheel of Fortune. If Philosophy's objective moralizing enables Wyatt to come his closest to Chaucer's poetic, however, it is Boethius as victim, the first-person sufferer of Fortune's blows, who, along with the suffering lover of Petrarch's sonnet, brings Chaucer closest to Wyatt. Chaucer's *Fortune* ("Balades de Visage sanz Peinture") consists of a dialogue between "Le Pleintif countre Fortune" and Fortune herself. There is no narrative context, so there is none of Chaucer's usual division between narrator and protagonist: the verses stand on their own as expressions of thought and feeling, like speeches in a drama, as Wyatt's poems do. *Fortune* is concerned with the same issues as *Truth*, that Fortune has no power over the man "that over

himself hath the maystrye".[28] The poem asserts the supremacy of the stable mind over mere event. The Plaintiff starts off in apparent opposition to Fortune, with the refrain,

> For fynally, Fortune, I thee defye!

Fortune, however, is as good a counsellor as is Philosophy, and on much the same principles:

> No man is wrecched, but himself it wene,
> And he that hath himself hath suffisaunce, (25-6)

lines that provide the meaning of her own refrain:

> And eek thou hast thy beste frend alyve.

By the end of the poem the two speakers share a common refrain that asserts a providential stability superior to Fortune: "In general, this reule may nat fayle".

Wyatt's adoption of this poem is as natural as his adoption of Petrarch: its inwardness caters immediately to his kind of poetic. "Most wretchid hart most myserable" (XCI) borrows phrasing, the debate structure with refrain and some of the themes from *Fortune*. Wyatt's dialogue is in four-line stanzas alternating between the speakers. One of these is the heart, that here stands apparently not for irrational passion but for the Boethian faculty of moral self-sufficiency. The other speaker is not defined: it is perhaps reason, in its fallible mortal aspect, telling him that despair is the only logical course, or perhaps passion acting under the guise of reason - but terminological definition is unnecessary when its function in the poem is so clear. Wyatt, in fact, takes still further the inwardness already present in *Fortune*: the opponents in the debate are now no longer man against an external Fortune, but both within himself, one principle urging him to give in, the other maintaining its assured conviction of its own truth.

> Most wretchid hart most myserable,
> Syns the comforte is from the fled,
> Syns all the trouthe is turned to fable,
> Most wretchid harte why arte thou nott ded?
>
> No, no, I lyve and must doo still,
> Whereof I thank God and no mo;
> Ffor I me selff have all my will,
> And he is wretchid that wens hym so. (XCI.1-8)

The heart's refrain is taken from Chaucer's "No man is wrecched, but himself it wene"; the "suffisaunce" of the man that "hath himself" becomes Wyatt's

> Who hath himself shal stande vp right. (23)

Both poems have a personal edge to them, though of a very different nature: Chaucer's turns into a plea for "beter estat", Wyatt

complains in veiled hints of political enemies, who

> whet their teth,
> Which to touche the somtime ded drede. (33-4)

As always, however, the hint of external action is not there to supply a narrative interest, but to feed the speaker's emotional reactions, and provide the mutable context in which the heart must assert its self-assurance.

Wyatt's lyrics may not have the intellectual weight or seriousness of his moral poems or satires, but they do share that concern to find a fixed point in an unstable world. If the search for truth remains constant, however, in these poems the ideal is unattainable. In the Boethian poems the conviction of one's own integrity may be enough for inner content; once someone else is involved, things get rather more complicated. Even if his love-poems give a very one-sided view of things, they are by definition about relationships, and the existence of the lady, however obliquely it may be implied, rules out self-sufficiency. This is further complicated by his principal choice of subject, of the lady's faithlessness rather than cruelty. A good relationship involves a committal of self at odds with Boethian self-sufficiency; and perpetual loss is echoed in a perpetual sense of bereavement. Moreover, the need to *give* in such a relationship may include the need to *give up* the lady: the generous and virtuous thing may lie in a rejection of stability and truth. This sense of loss and the paradoxical relationship of virtue and faithlessness are at the heart of Wyatt's greatest poem, "They fle from me".

The sense of loss runs throughout the poem, but it is set up in that first line: "flee" and its forms are crucial words for Wyatt. Except in the Boethian poems modelled on Chaucer's *Truth*, with their "flee from the rage / Of cruell wyll" or the satiric "fle therefore trueth", Wyatt almost always presents, not the protagonist fleeing from something - Chaucer's "Flee fro the prees", which implies again man *versus* the world outside him - but something fleeing from him, so that the loneliness and isolation of the individual spirit are emphasised:

> She fleith as fast by gentil crueltie. (LVI.5)

> As she fleeth afore
> Faynting I folowe. (VII.6)

> Light in the wynde
> Doth fle all my delight
> Where trouth and faithfull mynd
> Are put to flyght (LXXXIV.29-32)

> The comforte is from the fled. (XCI.2)

> What shulde I saye
> Sins faithe is dede
> And truthe awaye
> From you ys fled? (CCXV.1-4)

They fle from me that sometyme did me seke. (XXXVII.1)

A less attractive version of that appears in one of his poems on political instability:

They that somtyme lykt my companye
Like lyse awaye from ded bodies thei crall. (CCXLI.4-5)

One would expect love-poems to be about a coming together: Wyatt's are about a parting.

"They fle from me" is in many ways the obverse of Chaucer's *Truth*, in a way that emphasises difference rather than complementariness. Both are in rhyme royal, a form Wyatt reserves for his more thoughtful or weightier poems. *Truth* is about flight from earthly values and distrust of Fortune to find a point of stability in "sothfastnesse". Wyatt looks back on the way worldly pleasures have abandoned him, sees his happiness as having lain in Fortune's gift -

Thancked be fortune, it hath ben othrewise
Twenty tymes better (8-9)

- and ends on a curiously muted note of a questioning of the true nature of stable virtue. Chaucer's poem, like most of his *balades*, advocates a position of moral and religious absolutism comparable with the closing verses of *Troilus and Criseyde* - verses that present a notorious critical problem in that they appear to deny the human sensitivity and sense of dilemma of the rest of the work. "They fle from me" makes the dilemma its central concern; and if it can be paralleled with anything in Chaucer, it is much more with the main part of *Troilus* than with the moral poems. The combination of eroticism with insoluble moral and emotional problems never occurs so clearly outside these two poems in either author, even though the poems are formally worlds apart: Wyatt compresses the situation and the dilemma into three stanzas, and the inwardness, the overt identification of poet and protagonist, is all his own.

The ambivalent metaphor of the first stanza establishes the sense of insecurity in the poem. The question as to who is the hunter, who the prey, is never settled: the paradox is set up in the first line and kept in balance throughout the stanza. The world of "They fle from me" is the world of mutability, and of change for the worse:

Nowe they raunge
Besely seking with a continuell chaunge. (6-7)

"Range" is the technical term for hunting-dogs casting about for a scent:[29] once tame towards him, then wild, "they" are now in pursuit of something else entirely. In the second stanza he recalls what he has lost - not an emotion or a state, but an episode, where for a rare moment we see the lady, even if through his perceptions alone, and hear her speak. The moment is so surreal and transitory that his insistence that "it was no dreme" comes as no surprise, though

there has been no explicit suggestion that it might be one. The effect, oddly, is not of definiteness, as one would expect from such an assertion, but of unsureness, for this assurance only needs to be made when reality itself is in question. The unsureness and the sense of mutability extend throughout the last stanza, though now their sphere of operation is moral:

> But all is torned thorough my gentilnes
> Into a straunge fasshion of forsaking;
> And I have leve to goo of her goodeness,
> And she also to use new fangilnes. (16-19)

It is his nobility and generosity, his "gentilnes", that open the way to their "forsaking"; it is her "goodeness" that releases him, his that allows her unfaithfulness. Their very virtues are now agents of change for the worse. The last lines are not, I believe, sarcastic, though they may be wry. The question Wyatt is asking is a serious one.

> But syns that I so kyndely ame serued,
> I would fain knowe what she hath deserved. (20-1)

"Kyndely" is at once ironic - it was not kind of her to leave him - and paradoxically true, for it is her "goodeness" that has let him go. It also bears its mediaeval meaning of "according to one's nature, appropriate": she has given him what was to be expected from her, and he has got what he asked for. What, then, is her standing? Is there any distinction left between vice and virtue, integrity and disloyalty? There is perhaps a rueful sense of acceptance from him as to the way he has been "serued", almost Boethian in its readiness to take the bad with the good. But the point the argument has reached is very far from Boethius. Moral certainty and self-sufficiency are alike unattainable. The poem is making, in non-Boethian terms, the same point that Chaucer had explored through Troilus: that in the context of a love-relationship, Boethius does not help. The only point of rest is in the transitory moment of the bedroom, in the stroking of Criseyde's sides, or in

> "Dere hert, how like you this?" (14)

- and that is a moment that both Chaucer's lovers and Wyatt have to reassure themselves is not a dream.[30] It looks for a brief instant as if Wyatt is for once letting an event, an action, a speech, carry its own weight, but the impression is illusory - the moment exists only because it is impressed in the mind, with all the intensity that only the unreality, or ultra-reality, of dream can carry.

When Chaucer writes a full-scale dream poem, the dream represents the vehicle of some kind of higher authority: the vision is revealed to the dreamer from something beyond and outside him. The world of the mind offers nothing so comforting to Wyatt as authoritative judgement. At one extreme is the emotional disorientation of the "hertes forrest", at the other a prayer for "hertes Hierusalem", "the Syon of the ghost". Perhaps it is the impossibility of reconciling the two, or even of rejecting the one

for the other, that makes Wyatt so tonally different from Chaucer. Chaucer can always make the committed appeal, beyond the mutability of the world, to faith:

> He nyl falsen no wight, dar I seye. (*Tr* V. 1845)

> Trouthe thee shal delivere, it is no drede.
> (*Truth*, refrain)

There is nothing as clear as this in "They fle from me". Even at the level of syntax, the only words that approach the simplicity of such aphorisms are "Dere hert, how like you this?", and their simplicity solves nothing. There are no simple ways out. The really subversive thing about this poem is its implication that truth and falsehood may not, after all, be polar opposites.

NOTES

[1] These early references are collected by Patricia Thomson in *Wyatt: The Critical Heritage* (London, 1974): Surrey, *Epitaphium Tho. Wiat* 1.14 (p.30); John Leland, *Naeniae in mortem Thomae Viati* (1542) esp. A3^{v}, A4^{v} (p.25); Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* I.xxxi (p.34).

[2] The titles of their works are significant of this emphasis on context: H.A. Mason, *Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period* (London, 1959); John Stevens, *Music and Poetry at the Early Tudor Court* (London, 1961); Patricia Thomson, *Sir Thomas Wyatt and his Background* (London, 1964); Raymond Southall, *The Courtly Maker* (Oxford, 1964). Mason, Stevens and Thomson all stress the common fund of courtly clichés and conventions drawn on by Chaucer, Wyatt and contemporary love-lyric. Thomson gives the fullest discussion of Wyatt's debt to Chaucer and the Italians. Southall argues that Wyatt's debt to the Italians is comparatively superficial, and that the Chaucerian influence is of greatest ultimate significance. Muir and Thomson's *Collected Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (Liverpool, 1969) devotes a substantial amount of its commentary to sources and analogues. All quotations are taken from this edition, following Muir and Thomson's numbering.

[3] A number of articles have approached Wyatt independently of his models, notably those by Donald M. Friedman (in *Essays in Criticism* 16 (1966) 375-81, *Studies in English Literature* 7 (1967) 1-13 and *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 67 (1968) 32-48).

[4] C.E. Nelson's suggestion in "A Note on Wyatt and Ovid" (*Modern Language Review* 58 (1963) 60-3) that Wyatt is drawing on Ovid's *Amores* III.7 and I.5 relies on very tenuous similarities. L.E. Nathan noted a similarity to the Ballade 38 attributed to Charles d'Orleans ("Tradition and Newfangleness in Wyatt's 'They fle from me'", *Journal of English Literary History* 32 (1965), esp. pp.4, 9-10).

[5] All quotations from Chaucer are from *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* ed. F.N. Robinson (2nd. ed., 1957), using his abbreviations for the separate poems: *PF* 589; *FranklT* 1479; *Truth* (Balade de Bon Conseyl) 12.

[6] Wyatt makes even such a well-tried form his own, however. In "If thou wilt mighty be" (CCLXI) he rhymes on the unstressed syllable of feminine endings in the second verse (quoted below, p.106); in "Myne olde dere En'mye" (VIII) he experiments with half-rhyme in the first verse; in "They fle from me" (XXXVII) he slides the *b* and *c* rhymes into each other in the first verse through the series *remember - daunger - raunge*.

[7] Ed. W.E. Mead, EETS, OS 173 (1928) 11.568-74. To make the comparison fairer I have supplied modern punctuation.

[8] CCLXI.8-14, adapting *De Consolatione* III, metr. 6 (the other verses are from metr. 5 and 3). Any Chaucerian phrasing in the stanza does not necessarily come from a relationship with Chaucer's *Boece*: its dependence on that remains unproven (see Thomson's "Wyatt's Boethian Ballade", *Review of English Studies* 15 (1964) pp.262-7). There are, however, a few verbal similarities that do not seem to depend on a common original.

[9] See esp. Mason pp.159-71 and Stevens ch. 10.

[10] E.g. Wyatt V.2, cf. *KnT* 1566 (though the phrase was proverbial); XCII. 3, 4, 8, cf. *KnT* 1042, *Tr* II.112 and I.518; XCV.8, cf. *PF* 140; CCXII

1-2, cf. *PF* 1-2. Muir and Thomson note these and other similarities to Chaucer, including many of the stock idioms.

[11] CXVIII, "A face that shuld content me wonders well".

[12] To give two samples: of the first twenty poems in Muir and Thomson's edition, five are explicitly concerned with unfaithfulness (II, V, VI, XVI, XIX; it is perhaps hinted at in others), and none of these has a known source; and of probably the three best known of Wyatt's poems, "They fle from me" (XXXVII), "Blame not my lute" (CCV) and "My lute, awake!" (LXVI), the first two are concerned with unfaithfulness, only the last with the more conventional cruelty, and none has any known source.

[13] *Truth* ("Flee fro the prees").

[14] For further discussion see Southall pp.72-5.

[15] Wyatt XXVI, *Rime* CXXXIV (in Muir and Thomson's commentary; I have also used Piero Cudini's *Petrarca: Canzoniere* [3rd ed., Milan, 1977]).

[16] *Tr* I.415-8, translating "S'amor non è", *Rime* LXXXVIII.

[17] *Merciles Beaute* III.1.

[18] The word "thing" is sometimes used to refer to people, and especially women (see *OED*, s.v. "thing", sense 10), but in contexts that provide a person for the term to refer back to, so that the human reference is clear. Wyatt's use completely lacks this humanizing context.

[19] LXXVIII.10, XIII.14, LIII.21.

[20] "Wyll ye se what wonders love", CCXXXII.15-16, translating *Rime* CXXXV. The poem is unascribed in the Devonshire MS and is therefore excluded by Joost Daalder from his edition (*Sir Thomas Wyatt: Collected Poems* [London, 1975]), but the "unfixed" imagery of the poem is so characteristic of Wyatt that the case for attribution to him is very strong.

[21] The image occurs elsewhere in Petrarch (*Rime* CCXXXIX.37) and was in any case proverbial; the point remains that Wyatt adds it to this poem.

[22] IV.9-10, *Rime* CXL.9; Wyatt's usage is strikingly different from Petrarch's own references to woods elsewhere. Southall would read the image as "a touch of the countryside" (p.82n.). Traditionally, however, the forest is a fearsome place (as consistently in folktale), with symbolic implications of disorientation, the undiscovered self or even "psychological chaos" (see Winthrop Wetherbee, *Platonism and Poetry in the Twelfth Century* (Princeton, 1972) p.277).

[23] From the chorus "Stet quicumque vult" in *Thyestes*, 401-3.

[24] The Envoy, which is found in a single MS and none of the early printed editions, and would therefore not have been known to Wyatt, makes this turning outward even clearer in its injunction to

pray in general
For thee, and eek for other, hevenlich mede.

It is interesting that *Truth* was probably the best known of the minor poems, having been printed by Pynson (1526) as well as Caxton (c.1478) and Thynne (1532), though in this truncated form.

[25] Kenneth Muir, *Life and Letters of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (Liverpool, 1963) pp.41, 38.

[26] CVIII.503-5. This emphasis is missing not only in the Psalm itself but in Wyatt's other sources, including the paraphrase of Joannes Campensis (*Psalmorum omnium . . . paraphrastica interpretatio*, Lyons, 1533) or Pietro Aretino's much fuller *I Sette Salmi* (Venice, 1536).

[27] See Thomson's article cited in n.8 above.

[28] *Fortune* 14.

[29] *OED*, s.v. "range", sense 7a.

[30] *Tr* III.1341-4:

> Or elles, lo, this was hir mooste feere,
> That al this thyng but nyce dremes were;
> For which ful ofte ech of hem seyde, "O swete,
> Clippe ich yow thus, or elles I it meete?"

THE *DE ANALOGIA ANGLICANI SERMONIS* OF THOMAS TONKIS

By ALBERT B. COOK III

(i)

The unique manuscript of Thomas Tonkis's *De Analogia Anglicani Sermonis: Liber Grammaticus* (1612) is preserved in the Royal Manuscript Collection of the British Library (12.F.xviii). It consists of fifteen leaves measuring approximately 18.5 x 27.7 cm.. The definitive Warner and Gilson catalogue describes it as folio; the considerably older Casley catalogue, as quarto.[1] Since the manuscript is somewhat smaller than the usual folio page, Casley was probably describing size, not binding.

For the most part, the manuscript is both neatly and systematically penned, probably by the author himself, since casual errors are virtually non-existent. The body of the work is in Latin, penned in an Italian hand, while the English examples are set forth in a secretary hand, for contrast. This system is not completely consistent, for a few English words were inadvertently written in an Italian hand. Further, there are some marginal and interlinear insertions in a hasty but readable hybrid hand which, on the evidence of Greek characters in both the body of the manuscript and the additions, were almost certainly added by the same scribe who did the careful transcription. The last five pages, from f.13v on, are entirely in this same hybrid hand. The scribe exercised great care over the earlier portion of the manuscript, even to ruling multiple margins to help with his indentation, and he often left large spaces at the end of chapters and between major subheadings within chapters to allow for the possible insertion of more material.[2]

The presence of this manuscript in the Royal MS Collection can be traced to its dedication to Frederick V, Elector Palatine of the Rhine (1596-1632), and maternal grandfather of King George I. In the late fall of 1612, the year inscribed on the title page, Frederick was in England doing the ceremonial rounds prior to his marriage to the Princess Elizabeth in February, 1613. According to the biographical entry in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (VII, p.623), Frederick had received a creditable classical education at Sedan under Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne, Duc de Bouillon, spoke French as fluently as his native German, and was an accomplished Latinist. Curiously, this manuscript grammar, though written in Latin, often makes reference to French and to Greek, and, in a couple of instances,

to Spanish and Italian in defining English words and constructions, but never to German, except for an inserted marginal reference to the "German *g*". Although it is hard to imagine anyone actually learning to speak or understand English from this grammar, one can reasonably assume that it was presented to the young Elector, under circumstances which will probably remain for ever obscure, and was either placed in the library of James I at that time, or fortuitously survived the misfortunes of the "Winter King" of Bohemia and the Thirty Years' War which he helped to precipitate, to end up in the Hanoverian Royal Collection.

The latter is the more likely hypothesis, for the manuscript does not appear in the listings of Edward Bernard's *Catalogi Manuscriptorum Angliae* (1698), nor in the inventories of collections acquired after 1612, notably that of John Theyer (comp. 1678); but, as previously noted, it is listed in Casley (1734). The same is true of other MSS which were presented to the Elector and his bride: complimentary verses on the marriage by John Gordon (12.A.xxvii); a description of the display of fireworks following the ceremony by John Nodes and Thomas Butler (17.C.xxxv); and a French grammar dedicated to the Princess (16.E.vii). According to the respective entries in Warner and Gilson, these MSS are "Not in the old catalogues", which is also true of the Tonkis MS. However, a poem by William Vennor addressed to James I on the occasion of his daughter's marriage to the Elector (18.A.xxii) is listed in the Royal Library Catalogue of 1661 (Royal App. 86).[3] Therefore, the Hanoverian hypothesis is the most probable provenance of this manuscript, although there is also a very tenuous connection, through Trinity College, Cambridge, between the author and the Royal Librarian at the time of composition, Patrick Young. But all attempts to account for the presence of the manuscript in the Royal Collection are ultimately conjecture.

There are similar problems about the identity and the qualifications of the author, Thomas Tonkis. From the inscription of the title page, "Auctore Thoma Tonkisio Anglo è Collegio Sanctae et Individuae Trinitatis in Academia Cantabrigiensj", he can be identified only as a Thomas *Tomkis* who was admitted Scholar to Trinity College in 1599, and was B.A. in 1600/01 and M.A. in 1604. A careful check of Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigiensis* for the relevant period reveals no other possibility. That being the case, the said gentleman (and the spelling of his name in the documents is variously *Tunkes*, *Tonckes*, *Tompkys*, and *Tomkys*, though we will keep with the spelling which occurs twice on the manuscript) was born in Wolverhampton about 1580 or 1581. In 1583 the family moved to Shrewsbury, where his father, John, was the Public Preacher.[4] The third of four children, and the youngest son, Thomas was enrolled as *oppidan* at Shrewsbury School in 1591, but it is not known if he stayed on after the death of his father in the following year. He entered Trinity College, Cambridge, about 1597, proceeding through the course of honors and degrees previously mentioned, until 1610, when there is no further record of him in residence at the College. According to Mander, this would have been the longest he could have stayed on in residence without taking orders, and at any event, his residence was already jeopardized by his having apparently married

by 1603: there are records in Wolverhampton of baptisms of children of a Thomas Tonkis and his wife Margaret Brindley, in 1603/04, 1606, and 1614. A small inheritance in 1610 furnished him with the means to purchase land in Wolverhampton, where for the next ten years he appears in the records as an attorney of some standing, and thereafter as a supervisor of the local grammar school. He died in September, 1634, one year after the death of his wife.

He is best known as the author of two plays, the allegorical burlesque *Lingua* (1607), and especially *Albumazar* (1615),[5] based closely on the play *Lo Astrologo*, by Giambattista della Portas (1606). This second play was apparently first performed at Cambridge before James I on March 9, 1614/15, and although records are somewhat ambiguous on this point, it appears that Tonkis was recalled from Wolverhampton to write and direct it. The play is remembered primarily as the germ of Ben Jonson's *Alchemist*. Apart from the possibility of some other university plays, now lost, these, with the grammar, constitute his entire literary output.

This output, and the revelations of his life records, are summarized by Hugh Dick:

> The meager details of the man's career suggest an easygoing nature which was willing to accept a quiet, undistinguished place in life. His academic career suggests ability without brilliance; his return to the placidities of Wolverhampton proves his lack of literary ambition.[6]

As so often happens, the life records of the man of letters give practically no hint of the works themselves. In this instance, there is nothing in the records, or in the other pieces of writing attributed to him, which gives any hint of the grammarian, except his interest in the Wolverhampton school, many years after the writing of the grammar. Consequently, the questions of where the impetus of the work lay, what its intentions were, indeed, its whole background and *raison d'être*, will probably never receive other than conjectural answers.

(ii)

Nonetheless, the grammar remains for our study, and the life records of the author permit us to make the preliminary conclusions that it is the work of a linguistic amateur, and that where it represents his own usage it is the usage of a well-educated native of the West Midlands.

The first chapter (p.143ff., as here printed) is, loosely speaking, a phonology; the rest is a morphology. The discussion of the sounds of English is, not surprisingly, as they are represented in writing by the letters of the alphabet. The presentation is in alphabetical order, and the evidence, as E.J. Dobson indicates in his own discussion,[7] is less useful than one might wish, since it is essentially circular. Sounds are described with reference to letters in other languages, or Tonkis freely borrows from the disconcertingly vague traditional "phonological" vocabulary then in

general use, e.g., "exilè", "obscurè", "clarus", "sonorus". Consequently, it is not very helpful as a guide to the pronunciation of Early Modern English.

As might be expected, there is more material on the vowels than on the consonants. The letter *a* is "more thinly [i.e., less sonorously?] heard than the French *a*",[8] apparently to be sounded as /æ/. Before a double *l*, it is sounded as an "open" /a/, as also before the *l* plus a consonant in any position. The letter *e*, initially and medially, is sounded "like the French *e*", presumably /ɛ/, but it "virtually disappears" finally. However, it "should not be casually added on" as a final letter, because where properly used it renders an antecedent vowel "the more clear and resonant", as the examples given illustrate after a fashion. Before a final *n*, it becomes "obscure", presumably /ə/, as it does when written after final *l* (actually syllabic *l*) and between /v/ and *l*. Most of the discussion of *i* distinguishes between the vowel and the consonant, but Tonkis indicates that initially and medially the vowel is pronounced /ɪ/, while finally it is "stronger", especially, according to a hastily appended note, where written in verse for *y*.

The material given for *o* is somewhat more complex. Before two consonants, either initially or medially, it is either /ɔ/ "thick", or /ə/ "obscure", but before a single consonant it is /o/, possibly lengthened, "like omega". Finally before a consonant it is "obscure", though the examples given would indicate /a/; but if there is a final vowel, and the example indicates the final *e*, it is pronounced /o/. An exception is made for the sequence *ove*; the pronunciation is described only by the puzzling Latin non-word *clesmentia* (perhaps some form of *clemens* was intended). Tonkis indicates that before a final *n*, *o* is pronounced /ə/ "very obscurely", and /o/ before final *w*. Double *o* is pronounced "like the French *ou*;" that the examples include *good*, *blood*, and *flood* suggests some shifting between the indicated /u/ and the expected /ʊ/. As with *i*, the discussion of *u* is largely taken up with distinguishing the consonant /v/ from the vowel. Once this ground is cleared, Tonkis indicates that the vocalic *u* before a single consonant is pronounced /iu/ "as if an *i* were inserted", but before two consonants, "the *i* sound is removed", as is the case "finally before stops", presumably indicating /ʊ/.

This is scanty, inferential material, and the entries for the consonants are generally even less helpful. There is nothing either significant or particularly striking in the discussion of *b*, *f*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *p* (*ph* is described as "frothy", like *phi*), *q* ("never written without *u*"), *r*, *t*, consonantal *u* (/v/), *wh* (sounded "with the greatest aspiration"), *x*, *y* ("written for *j*"), or *z*. These letters are usually described as being sounded "like the French", or whatever, with some examples following.[9]

But for some of the other consonant letters there is evidence, however small, of significant observation on Tonkis's part or at least of something requiring further study and commentary. With *c*, for instance, he makes the traditional Latin distinction between /s/ "before *e* or *i*", and /k/ "before *a*, *o*, *u*", a distinction made without examples, indicative, perhaps, of over-reliance upon

classroom Latin models. He likens *ch* to the Spanish *ch* or the Italian *c* before *e* or *i* (thus /tʃ/), except in words of Greek derivation. As a preterit or participial ending for a verb, the *d* is "clearly heard", not as /t/, "as the French customarily do". The letter *g* is pronounced /dʒ/ before *e* and *i*, with the indication of several exceptions, but is pronounced "like the German *g*" in present participle and other *ng* circumstances, which would seem to indicate, contrary to the usual opinion, that the *-ing* was still pronounced /ɪŋg/, rather than /ɪŋ/ or /ɪn/, at least in the West Midlands. The combination *gu* is /g/, save for some words of Italian derivation; however, Tonkis indicates that *gh* in mid-syllable "represents a gutteral sound", but it is difficult to believe that there would be more than a vestigial [x] or [ç] at this date.[10] Similarly, under *k*, the example *knaue* might be taken as evidence for the hint of a /k/ before /n/. The letter *h* is "rarely unaspirated", though some exceptions are listed. Tonkis then notes that it adds a "breathing quality" when appended to letters, but his example *thigh* is unfortunately ambiguous: the reference would be to either the *th* or the *gh* (if the latter, it again suggests [ç]). Along this line, he later distinguishes between the voiceless *th* ("like *theta*") and the voiced ("like final Spanish *d*"); generally it is voiced medially, except in words of Greek derivation, and voiceless finally and initially, but he lists exceptions to all three instances. The letter *s* is indicated as being pronounced /z/ intervocalically; one assumes that elsewhere it is voiceless. The combination *sh* is described as /ʃ/, "like French *ch* . . . or Italian *sc*". The letter *w*, unhelpfully said to be sounded "in its own characteristic manner", is described as the second element in a consonant cluster with *s, d, t*; but following *a, e, o,* "it is sounded diphthongally, like *u*".

Appended to this chapter on pronunciation is a brief section on "diphthongs", actually *digraphs*, for Tonkis lists double letter combinations rather than vowel sound combinations within a syllable. The entries are therefore of only marginal usefulness, and then only if the cognate sound specified in another language can be identified. For this reason, the entries for *ae, ai, au, eu,* and *oa* are not very helpful. Tonkis posits an *ei* in artificial contradistinction to *ai*. However, *ea* might be likened to /ɛ:/ ("like the French masculine *e*"), *ou* is apparently /əu/ ("more open than the French *ou*"), but *oi* is truly a puzzle ("like *oy* in *moy*").

In addition to the phonological material just described, which constitutes the whole of Chapter One, there are two implicit indications throughout the manuscript of phonological evidence of a sort. One of these is the listing of certain contractions in the paradigms of declensions and conjugations. The second is the habit of marking the stressed syllable on some of the English words.

Contractions are first listed in the section on the declension of the articles in Chapter Two, and also appear in the chapters which follow. Basically they indicate spoken as against written usage, with a possibility of dialectal variations as well. The following list (with line numbers given in parentheses) includes some of the contractions mentioned which might be expected at the time

the manuscript was written: *o'the* (167), *th'asse* (171), *th'host* (174: earlier, it was indicated that *host* has a silent *h*); *ómmee*, *tómmee* (324: for "of me", "to me", respectively, the spelling indicating /ə/ in the stressed syllable); *on'im* "of him", *to'em* "to them" (326); *to'er* (327); *thou lou'st* (373); *lou'd* (377); *let's* (401); *hee's*, *y'are* "you are" (455). Sometimes we have a progression, as *hee had* to *hee'ad* to *hee'd* (383). It is made evident that some contracted forms are joined to the preceding word, as in *o'th'*, *toth'*, *byth'* (167), and in his illustrative sentence *I know th' man* (185), Tonkis notes that "*th* is joined to the preceding word", in effect making it *knowth*. Some of the contractions are much less common in primary source material, and might therefore be indicative of dialectal usage: *wummee* as contrasted with *wimmee* "with me" (324); *wee-you* "with you" (325);[11] *the loue* "they love" (373); *hee'as*, *y'a* "you have" (and *th'a* "they have" [380]); and *th'are* "they are" (455). Finally, as an indication of the changing of an inflected ending, *hee lou's* is listed as the "contraction", and thus the spoken counterpart of, *hee loueth* (373).

Some of the contractions listed, however, are problematical. For instance, *of*, as listed in the declensions with *of the* (167), *of a* (177), *of the man* (185) and *of us* (324) is shown to have a contracted form *ov*. Dobson (I, p.316) concludes that Tonkis here is indicating that the formal /f/ becomes informal /v/. There is the ambiguous entry at the end of Chapter One which might buttress this argument: "Consonants at the end of a word are pronounced most distinctly". However, we have already pointed out that Tonkis intends the contracted form to indicate spoken, rather than written usage. Along the same line, "could", "would", and "should" are "contracted" respectively to *cou'd* (424), *woo'd* or *wu'd*, and *shu'd* (437). Though the "uncontracted" forms *may* have been spoken in very formal circumstances, it is not wise to push this possibility very far.

The marking of the stressed syllable goes on in an unsystematic way throughout the whole manuscript. In some passages, almost all of the English words are so marked, but not in others. There is no real method to the markings, and nowhere in the text is any rationale given. Generally speaking, the stress markings are precisely as one would expect them then or now, but there are a few exceptions. For instance, *éuél* "evil" (44) is marked with stress on both syllables. There are a few indications, all open to question, of what today would be incorrectly marked stress: *vntò* (497), *intò* (498) and *díctateth* (767).[12] Occasionally, too, there is a stressed monosyllable: *thínck* (105), *heeré*, *theré* (715), but with respect to the last two mentioned, it should be said that virtually every other English word in the section ("Adverbs") is marked for stress, and perhaps the writer just got carried away. Sometimes the stress markings might have possibilities as evidence, if independently verified elsewhere, like *orátìon* (84), which suggests a four-syllable pronunciation, and *lóued* (377), *hánged* (619), *loósed* (633), *thrówen* (700), which suggest a disyllabic pronunciation.

In sum, then, Tonkis's descriptions of the sounds of English are of only limited usefulness to anyone studying the pronunciation

of Early Modern English. The circularity of the examples given, the appeal to other languages, including the classical languages, as norms, his use of traditional terminology, but most importantly, his constant use of writing and spelling as his criteria, all indicate that we must be most cautious in drawing conclusions. One wonders, in passing, just what the Warner and Gilson Catalogue annotator was using as a basis of comparison when he wrote, "The directions for pronunciation are unusually full . . . ."[13]

Chapters Two to Six, the sixth chapter having several major sub-sections, together constitute a "morphology", in the wider sense of the term. Here, too, Tonkis is the slave to custom, for his organizational model is traditional Latin grammar, and his examples and paradigms closely follow the standard Latin pattern. For instance, the genitive of the definite article is *of the*, the dative *to the*, and so on. In particular, the verbs are described in the traditional tense sequences which antedate the Lily-Colet grammar. Nevertheless, there are some surprises, some indications of linguistic acumen, some details concerning contractions, dialect forms, and word derivations, which make this more than just another Latin-based grammar. Some of these areas of significance form part of the discussion below.

In Chapter Two, "On the Articles" (p.145ff.), the model generally appealed to is French. There is the traditional distinction between the finite and the infinite, with the predictable definitions, not always helpful in themselves, but made more understandable by the illustrative examples. The actual declension is Latin in its order, with prepositions doing the work of Latin case endings. As we have already noted, Tonkis here distinguishes between the full written form and the contracted spoken form, in the course of which it becomes evident that he is not necessarily setting up a contrast between standard forms and "low" forms. One unusual area in this chapter is the listing of an exceptional instance when a proper noun or a pronoun can take an article - a section which, as we will detail later, shows up practically verbatim in Ben Jonson's grammar.

Chapter Three, "On the Distinction of the Nouns" (p.146ff.), likewise uses the traditional Latin declensions. There is, as well, a backward look at the Latin concept of gender ("articles, nouns, participles do not recognize gender"; the pronouns *he* and *she* "refer to words in which there is a sex distinction") and a similar appeal occurs in the section on number. Generally, the plural is described solely in terms of writing, "by adding *s* to the singular", but there are a select number of instances given where the spelling calls for *-es*, as well as a list of nouns in which a stem *f* becomes a *v*. Appended to the chapter is a small but reasonably characteristic list of irregular plurals. The examples *bee/been* and *cow/kine* indicate a slightly conservative tendency in the author; the example *sow/swine* is etymologically dubious at best, but turns up in the work of several later seventeenth-century grammarians.

Chapter Four, "On the analogous forms of the Nouns" (p.147ff.), deals in an interesting way with what today would be called derivational affixes. First is described the creation of adjectives from substantives, with the addition of a suffix. The affixes given

are *-less*, *-ful*, *-ly* (described as being "similar to *like*"; *lovely* is a dubious illustration); *-y*, *-en* ("adjective of material", as *oaken*); *-some* ("added to a substantive *or adjective*", my italics: *noisome* is an example of the latter, given without comment); and *-ish* (which "added to a substantive . . . retains its meaning", but "added to an adjective, lessens its meaning"). The comment on the prefix *un-* does not fit this substantive-to-adjective pattern; the passage was added later in the hybrid hand, probably in this linguistically inappropriate spot because of the semantic similarity to *-less*. It is specifically likened to the Greek α-negative prefix. Mention is made here of the ability to combine negative forms, e.g., *unharmless* (". . . infrequent, but linguistic analogy can allow this freedom").

The second set of derivations are listed as those which create substantives from adjectives, as with *-ness*, but most of the examples are noun from noun, as with *-ful*, *-hood* (*-head*), *-ship*, *-dom*. An interesting example is the combination *spit/spitful*, glossed "veru", and thus is clearly not *spite/spiteful*, which is in fact mentioned in the next paragraph. The third section treats of substantives created from verbs, as with *-er*, here given as *-r*, and *-ment*. In describing the latter, Tonkis limits its use to verbs ending in *-dge*, *-sh*, *-ise*, *-ze*, with the examples *judgement*, *punishment*, *disguisement*, *amazement*.[14] The fourth section covers the creation of adverbs from adjectives with the addition of *-ly*. This category is extended to some derived adjectives, including some forms previously mentioned, and participles. Among the examples given are *goodlily*, listed in the OED as obsolete, the sole citation being in Chaucer; and *stealingly*, listed as common in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the sense of "furtively".

These sections on "analogy" are followed by a section on adjective comparison, it being usual for the grammars of the period to include both nouns and adjectives under the "substantive" label. Comparison is described with the inflections *-er*, *-est*, but the examples given are awkward by today's standards: *hopefuller*, *lovinger*. The superlative is cited with a contracted form, *hopeful'st*, etc., a possible instance of a poetic contraction, which Tonkis allows for as well as those which occur in the spoken language (see p.146). Mention is also made of periphrastic comparison with *more/most*, *less/least*, but no guidance is given on their use as distinct from the inflected use, though the examples given include *more/most hopefull*. Marginally appended to a discussion of irregularly compared adjectives is a list, in the hybrid hand, of quasi-superlatives in *-most*.

This chapter is concluded with a brief list of diminutives, especially of nicknames and of baby animals. The semantic oddities in this list include *bulchin* (listed as obsolete in the OED), *bullock* (which apparently originally *was* diminutive), and the combination *stare/starling*, both referring to the same obnoxious bird, though the former form is now listed in the OED as obsolete or dialectal. All in all, this chapter is useful for what it tells of Tonkis's own powers of observation; one wishes that the treatment were more exhaustive.

The fifth chapter, "On Pronouns" (p.151ff.) consists mainly of the traditional paradigms of declensions, interesting primarily for the lists of contractions, already mentioned. What is particularly noteworthy is that there is no reference at all to *it*, either directly or to the oblique forms. In describing the relative pronouns, Tonkis states that *which* and *that* can "refer to things or persons", but *who* "refers only to persons". In a final section, *his* is shown to be the basis of the possessive (*Virgill his life*), but mention is quickly made of the written and spoken "contraction", *Virgil's life*, one of the earliest systematic instances of the consistent use of the apostrophe for the genitive. Tonkis also notes the syllabic form after a final sibilant, as *Polibius'us historie*.[15]

Chapter Six, (p.152ff.) the largest in the entire manuscript, begins with the English verbs. The organization is severely paradigmatic, closely following the Latin forms, even to using *to love* as the general example. There is a good deal of artificiality in the presentation, especially in such wooden (and yet longstanding) concepts as the optative mood (p.154) "I pray God I love" or "I would to God I loved". Nor is there much usefulness in describing a given form as being rendered by a specified Greek or French form.

However, there are some significant statements which indicate that Tonkis was observing his native language with reasonable alertness. He indicates that the "secondary" present tense, with *do*, as *I do love*, etc., is used "for emphasis, or in questions", though he sometimes includes it interchangeably with the "primary" present form *I love*, etc. (p.153). Discussing the "primary" future, with *will*, he indicates that in the first person, singular and plural, this form is used to state volition, but in the other persons, it indicates either volition or simple future time, his examples indicating that a lot depends upon the context. Then he states that the "secondary" future, with *shall*, implies necessity and certainty, sometimes with "imperative force", although somewhat cryptically noting that the "first person of whatever number never holds out a promise to the rest", and later, much the same thing is indicated about the second and third persons. "But it is otherwise with the Scots, who when they should say *I will love*, say *I shall love you*" (p.154).

In a similar way, Tonkis divides up the "potential mood" (p.155). The "primary" form, with *can*, indicates possibility. The "secondary" form, with *may*, basically indicates permission, although one example is given of its signification of opportunity. The imperfect forms, in *could* or *might*, are said to signify much the same as their present forms, and so on through some of the other synthetic forms, though Tonkis sometimes has trouble finding a Latin equivalent for some of them: "I can have loved" is glossed as *amaverim*, and "I may have loved" as *forte an amaverim*. Although Tonkis is trying to establish something like the "ability-permission" distinction which is still observed in traditional grammars, if not in real life, we must at least consider these descriptions seriously as indications of the writer's usage, unless it can be clearly shown that Tonkis was only following an already established artificial tradition.

The paradigms of the subjunctive and the infinitive show us nothing of significance, nor do the lengthy paradigms for the verb *be*. Likewise, a discussion of the formation of verbs with some standard prefixes does not yield us anything that is new, although it is interrupted to discuss the treatment of forms analogous to the Latin supines (the discussion indicates that they are best handled by the prefix *a-* plus the present participle) and later to discuss the formation of verbs from nouns, and the use of participles as adjectives. This brings us to the most interesting part of the chapter, the listing of the principal parts of "anomalous" verbs (p.160).

Tonkis has already indicated that he considers regular English verbs to be those which take a dental suffix in the preterit, though his discussion is done in terms of writing. This list of anomalies, therefore, though presented unsystematically by alphabetical order, generally treats of those verbs with vowel gradation, with a few exceptions, like *can, could, bene able*. For the most part, this listing seems to reflect early seventeenth-century usage with only a few possible dialectal variants. The latter, like root *came*; past ("aorist") *clombe*, *hat* (for "hit"), *loape* ("leaped"), *raught* ("reached"), *snew'd*, *stooke* ("staked in gambling"), and *thewd* ("thawed"); and participial *lopen*, *loden*, and *writhen*, tend to indicate that the author's home area is generally West- to North-west-Midland, but nothing more definite than that. There is a problem in this section with spelling consistency: the principal parts *beat, beet, beaten*; *shead, shed, shed*; *spread, spred, spred*; and *sweat, swett, swett* all need to be worked out before one can rely on the phonological evidence.

This chapter on verbs is the last of the sections specifically marked off as a chapter in itself. From this point until the end of the manuscript there are major sections, but no new chapters as such. The sections which follow are on adverbs, conjunctions, and prepositions, but all of them are glorified glosses, giving us no linguistic information, and very little of semantic interest. With the section on prepositions, the carefully copied portion of the manuscript comes to an end.

Beginning on f.13v (p.165ff.) are three sections written in the hasty hybrid hand. A section on permutation discusses how one part of speech may substitute for another. A section on etymology takes up the anglicising of Latin derivatives, after a brief discussion of the sources of English borrowings. Finally, a section on arrangement discusses the positioning of words and modifiers. All of these sections contain some interesting English examples. The bold appending of a "finis" toward the bottom of f.15v is a clear indication that the manuscript can be considered complete as to sections, although Tonkis left space for additional material in some of the preceding parts.

(iii)

With someone whose credentials are as obscure as those of Tonkis, one immediately looks for parallels in grammars of English

which appeared before or nearly contemporaneously with his. However, this has proved to be a fruitless task. Tonkis was not primarily interested in spelling and spelling reform, and this lack of interest is demonstrated by a corresponding lack of parallels in the works of the spelling reformers: Thomas Smith, *De Recta et Emendata Linguae Anglicae Scriptione* (1568), John Hart, *An Orthographie* (1569), and Richard Mulcaster, *The First Part of the Elementarie* (1582). There is a superficial resemblance between Tonkis's work and William Bullokar's *Pamphlet for Grammar* (1586, sometimes called the *Bref Grammar for English*), but this is primarily in the arrangement, using the traditional system of declensions and conjugations, and indicative of a similarity of source: the classical tradition exemplified by the Lily-Colet grammar. There is also a surface similarity to Paul Graves's (or Greaves's) *Grammatica Anglicana* (1594), mostly in the terseness of comment, leading to spottiness. But the differences are again far greater, in that Graves has a Ramean bias, that there are no similarities in either content or examples (except where a paucity of examples makes overlapping inevitable, as with "anomalous" forms), and that an entire second part on syntax has no counterpart in Tonkis. Further, in those grammars which appeared immediately after Tonkis's, namely Alexander Hume, *Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue* (c. 1617), also part of the Royal MS Collection, and Alexander Gil, *Logonomia Anglica* (1619, 1621), there is no indication that the writers were aware of the Tonkis work at all. But the situation is significantly, if not dramatically, otherwise when one turns to the *English Grammar* of Ben Jonson (1644).

Almost immediately we find a striking similarity with the opening passage of Tonkis:

> A, With us, in most words is pronounced lesse, then the *French* à, as in,
>
> *art. act. apple. ancient.*
>
> But, when it comes before *l.* in the end of a Syllabe, it obtaineth the full *French* sound, and is utter'd with the mouth, and throat wide open'd, the tongue bent backe from the teeth, as in
>
> *al. smal. gal. fal. tal. cal.*
>
> So in the Syllabes, where a *Consonant* followeth the *l.* as in
>
> *Salt. malt. balme. calme.*[16]

Both the text and the examples closely parallel Tonkis. Another similarity occurs in Jonson's discussion of the article, which he appends to a chapter on the Parts of Speech, the article being an addition to the traditional eight:

> The *finite* is set before *Nounes Appellatives:* as
>
> *The* Horse. *The* Tree.
>
> *The* Earth. or specially
>
> *The* nature of the Earth.
>
> *Proper Names,* and *Pronounes* refuse *Articles,* but for *Emphasis* sake: as
>
> *The* Henry *of* Henries.

The only *Hee* of the Towne.
where *Hee* stands for a *Noune*, and signifies *Man*. (p.506)

One is again struck both by the similarity in the organization and in the examples, particularly the long and unusual list of articles with proper nouns or pronouns. But the most striking passage of all is the virtually complete inclusion of Tonkis's "De Compositione" (p.166) *as a marginal addition* to Jonson's chapter 8, "The Notation of a Word." Jonson's passage in full is as follows:

Compositio.
Saepe tria coagmen[*tantur*] *Nom*[*ina*]*:*
A foot-ball-plaier.
A Tennis-court-keeper.
Saepissimè duo Substant[*iva*] *:*
ut Hand-ker chif. Rain-bow.
Ey-sore. Table-napkin.
Head-ach, κεφαλαλγία.
Substantivum cum verbo:
[*ut*] Wood-bind.
Pronomen cum Substantivo:
ut Self-love, φιλαυτία.
self-freedome, αὐτονομια.
Verbum cum substantivo:
ut A Puff-cheeke, φυσιγνάθος
Draw-well. Draw-bridge.
Adjectivum cum Substantivo:
ut New-ton, νεάπολις.
Handi-craft, χειροσοφία.
Adverbium cum Substantivo:
ut Down-fall.
Adverbium cum Participio:
ut Vp-rising. Downe-lying. (pp.504-5)

Except for the addition of the entry "Adverb with Substantive" this passage shows every appearance of having been hastily taken from Tonkis, or from a common source. But this is practically the only section of Jonson which is directly parallel to Tonkis. Although other sections, like the chapter on diminutives of the nouns, have examples and discussion similar to those in Tonkis, they differ in that Jonson's are far more systematic.

Occasionally one finds the same examples used. Where Tonkis cites *languish, anguish* as examples of the *g* + *u* in the Italian manner, Jonson cites *Guin, guerdon, languish, anguish*. But as one moves through both works, one finds fewer and fewer correspondences, and where they exist, it can be attributed to the limitations implicit in the subject, rather than any overt copying. Such is certainly the case with the pronoun, and such probably accounts for the fact that Tonkis and Jonson both cite the same 112 irregular verbs in their lists, with an additional 19 in Jonson not in Tonkis, and an additional 39 in Tonkis not in Jonson. The key factor is Jonson's systematic presentation; where Tonkis is systematic, it is only in the old traditional sense, a sense which Jonson eschews.

There are several other considerations to take into account on this point. Foremost is the fact that the Jonson work was published long after the date on the Tonkis MS, and even if they were at work on them at roughly the same time, there is the fact of the fire in 1623 which destroyed a preliminary manuscript of the Jonson grammar. Further, the Jonson work, which was posthumously published, was variously derivative, primarily from Mulcaster (a source which he never acknowledged), Smith, and Ramus. It is possible that Jonson was able to see the Tonkis manuscript, so as to make the rather minimal use of it cited above (for only the three passages quoted in full above show direct influence) and it is likewise possible that he was able to weave further strands of it into his own work, as exemplified by the occasional use of the same or similar examples. *This conclusion is further buttressed by Jonson's systematic* approach, which makes Tonkis seem almost random by comparison. The only other possibility is the use of common sources, which must, for the moment, remain unknown.

As Ian Michael comments, "No common English source suggests itself, and the question is roused whether Tomkis [*sic*] saw the first, and full, form of Jonson's grammar, or whether Jonson saw Tomkis's."[17] It is a question for which there is no very satisfactory answer.

With the understanding, then, that there are still many questions and problems about it that cannot be answered at this time, an edition of the Tonkis grammar still should be available to scholars in the field. For despite its heavy overlay of the Latin tradition, it makes its small contribution to our understanding of the grammar of Early Modern English.

A Note on the Edition

This edition attempts to represent the original manuscript faithfully, with the following exceptions. All abbreviations have been expanded, some silently, as for instance the macroned (or tilded) vowel (for *m* or *n* following), the tailed *q* (*que*), the barred *p* (*per*), and such obvious grammatical terms as *singul.*, *plu(r).*, *perf.*. Where there may be doubt mention is made of the crux in the textual notes. The punctuation is made consistent (as in the use of a comma before *ut* prior to a series of examples; a colon in like circumstances where *ut* is omitted; alternating comma/semi-colon in a complex series) but no attempt is made to conform rigidly to modern standards of punctuation and capitalization. The basic content is Tonkis's own; these are aids to the reader.

As for the typography, the basic Latin text is in Roman type. In order to supply emphasis by "calling out" letters, words, and phrases, *italics* have been used, except for English examples, which are in CAPS. Any significant extensions of the manuscript, apart from the traditional abbreviations described above, are enclosed in [brackets]. Additions to the manuscript in the so-called hybrid hand are enclosed in <angles>.

Because the lines as printed here do not "turn" precisely as they do in the manuscript, line numbers, inserted for ease of reference, follow the printed form. However we have followed the manuscript as far as possible in starting new lines for new topics and in indentation. Multiple bracketed lines, as for instance in noun, pronoun, and verb paradigms, are counted as one line.

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1 Sir George F. Warner and Julius P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collection* (London, 1921) II, p.66; and David Casley, *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the King's Library* (London, 1734) p.213.

2 These insertions in the hybrid hand are identified in this edition of the text by enclosure in angles < >. Mention of space allowances is made in the textual notes.

3 The Royal Collection, sometimes called the "Old Royal" Collection, to distinguish it from the "King's Library" of George III, consists of the manuscripts "collected by successive sovereigns of England from Edward IV to George II, who transferred them to the newly founded British Museum by Letters patent of 6 August 1757" (British Museum, *Catalogues of the Manuscript Collections* (London, 1962) p.12). In the physical arrangement of the Royal Collection itself, press 12 "begins with a number of the complimentary books presented to sovereigns, and goes on with grammar, astrology, medicine . . ." (M.R. James, "The Royal Manuscripts at the British Museum", *The Library*, Fourth Series, 2 (1921-22) p.196).

4 This and the following biographical information is taken primarily from Hugh G. Dick's introduction to his edition of the play *Albumazar* (University of California Publications in English 13 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1944) pp.1-16) and the note by Gerald P. Mander in *TLS*, March 31, 1945, p.151. The entry in DNB (XIX, pp.940-1) has several substantive errors and omissions and cannot be trusted.

5 Ed. cit., note 4 above.

6 Op. cit., p.9. It might be noted that none of the biographers mentioned above seems to have been aware of the existence of the grammar.

7 *English Pronunciation 1500-1700* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1968) I, pp.313-16. Reference to this manuscript is also made, though in a different context, in Ian Michael, *English Grammatical Categories and the Tradition to 1800* (Cambridge, 1970) *passim.*

8 A complete translation of Tonkis's Latin text is not supplied in this edition, but translations of individual words and phrases are given as they arise throughout this Introduction.

9 It might be added here that the example *Paulsgraue*, given for the letter *p*, refers not to the author of *L'Eclaircissement de la Langue Francaise* (1530), as Dobson seems to believe (I, p.315n), but to the Elector Palatine himself (see OED, s.v. "palsgrave"). There is no evidence, explicit or otherwise, that Tonkis was even aware of John (or Jean) Palgrave's work.

10 One of the examples given is *spright*, which is historically *sprite* or *spirit*, just one more indication that Tonkis was overcompensating for the spelling.

11 And not just *wee*, as Dobson has it (I, p.316), conjecturing that it might be dialectal "with ye". There are, in fact, several errors in transcription in Dobson's discussion.

[12] Almost all of the stress markings are with the *acute* accent, but occasionally there is a *grave*: *underneàth* (104), *to dispùte* (but *dispûter*, 281). Normally, Tonkis uses the *grave* only to mark Latin adverbial forms. A circumflex is also used, though not consistently, on *O*, as a (somewhat artificial) way of differentiating the vocative from a mere expression of surprise.

[13] Op. cit., note 1 above.

[14] One can bring to mind *commandment*, *advancement*, *commencement*, *inducement*, *debatement*, among others, all of which appear in Shakespeare, to give the lie to this surprising statement.

[15] Dobson (I, p.316) makes mention of this as an apparent pronunciational variation, as against *Claudius'is* and *Plautus'is* in the same passage, but it is difficult to make much phonological significance out of such a spelling. Besides, one wonders why Tonkis did not make like "variations" elsewhere in the work.

[16] *The Oxford Jonson*, ed. C.H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford, 1947) VIII, p.471. All further citations of the Jonson *English Grammar* are given parenthetically from this edition and volume. It is interesting to note that both Tonkis and Jonson cite *apple* and *ancient* as examples of the same *a* sound, which might be an indication of a variant pronunciation in the development of *a* + nasal (Tonkis includes *answer* as well).

[17] *English Grammatical Categories*, p.549.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The text and the two illustrative facsimiles of the original MS are reproduced by permission of the British Library.

This project was supported in part by a grant from the Office of Research Administration, The University of Kansas. A preliminary version of this edition and commentary was read by Dr C.L. Barber, and the editor has benefitted greatly from his comments.

De Analogia [f.1]

Anglicani Sermonis

Liber Grammaticus

Auctore

Thoma Tonkisio Anglo 5

è Collegio

sanctæ et individuæ Trinitatis

in

Academia Cantabrigiensj

Anno salutis 10

MDCXIJ

[Blank] [f.1v]

Illustrissimo Principi Friderico eius nominis [f.2]

Quinto Romani Imperij Electori et

Archidapifero Comiti Palatino ad Rhenum

et Vtriusque Bauariæ Duci etc.: 15

Dedicat inscribis

Thomas Tonkis

[Blank] [f.2v]

De literis

Caput primum

Literæ vocales sunt quatuor et viginti

a apud nos exilius exauditur quam a Gallicum. ut apple, answere, auncient,

a. At in fine ante duplex l, pronuntiatur ut apud Gallos, patentius et [illegible], ut all, smalle, talle, falle.

Sic in principio, medio et fine eorum quæ consonantem post l habent, ut, ralmenelle, unfaithe, falt.

bee b, ut b gallicum. beniamin.

cee c ut apud gallos, ante e et i cum sibilo ut s. ante a, o, u, ut k vel q.

ch ut ch hispanorum, mucho, mucha; vel ut c ante e vel i apud Italos ut, cento [illegible] cheerefull, chimney, chinke, chosen.

Excipe vocabula a græcis deducta ut Stomack, ubi ch ut k.

dee d. ut d Gall: in fine vero vocabuli liquidius auditur. ut proferdo, lobdo non proferet louet, ut galli solent.

e e in principio et medio ut e Gallorum in fine vero pene deperit, tenuiter tamen non adscribitur, producit enim vocalem antecedentem, eamque reddit magis claram et sonorum ut spit, spite, clork, cloke, pil, pile.

e ante n in fine dictionis obscure sonat, ut smitten, strengthen, lengthen.

e post l in fine obscure ut tickle, brittle, fickle, trumble, tremble.

e ante l solum in fine modo u consonans præcedat, obscure ut drivel, swivel evil, shovel.

e [illegible] sonat a, ut arrident [illegible] ut [illegible]

ef f. ut f Gall: ut, fill, fillbert.

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

gee g ante e et i vocales ut g Italicum, ut [illegible] [illegible]erk.

Excipe, quæ cum compositis, girdle, gurt, gimlett.

* hoc est ut G Germanorum Excipe omnia etiam [illegible] [illegible] habent [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ut living, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ut gi* ut, [illegible], [illegible] sing, sling, [illegible]

g ante [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] languish, anguish, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ut sprigt, [illegible], thought, naught, taught, fraught, [illegible], raught.

ach h [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] [illegible]

h [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ut [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

BL MS Royal 12.F.xviii, f.3.

De Literis [f.3]

Caput primum.

Literæ nobis sunt quatuor et vigintj. 20
a apud nos exiliùs exauditur quam *a* Gallicum, vt ÁPPLE,
ÁNSWERE, ÁNCIENT.
a. At in fine ante duplex *l*, pronuntiatur vt apud Gallos,
patentj et hiulco sono, vt ALL, SMALL, TALL, FALL.
Sic in principio, medio et fine eórum quæ consonantem
post *l* habent, vt CÁLMENESSE, VNFÁLTIE, FALT.
bee *b*. vt *b* gallicum. BENIAMIN.
cee *c* vt apud gallos. ante *e* et *j* cum sibilo vt *s*. ante *a*, *o*, *u*,
vt κ. vel *k*.
ch. vt *ch* hispanorum, *mucho*, MUCH; vel vt *c* ante *e* vel *j* apud 30
Italos, vt *cento*: CHEEREFULL, CHIMNEY, CHINKE, CHOSEN.
Excipe vocabula a Græcis deducta vt EUNUCH, vbi *ch* vt κ.
dee *d*. vt *d* Gallicum, in fine vero vocabulj liquidiùs auditur, vt
PROFERED, LOUED, non PROFERET, LOUET, vt galli solent.
e *e*. in principio et medio vt *e* Gallorum, in fine vero penè
deperit, temerè tamen non adscribitur, producit enim
vocalem antecedentem, eamque reddit magis claram et
sonoram, vt SPIT, SPITE, CLOCK, CLOKE, PIL, PILE.
e ante *n* in fine dictionis obscurè sonat, vt SWÉETEN,
STRÉNGTHEN, LÉNGHTHEN. 40
e post *l* in fine obscurè, vt TÍCKLE, BRÍTTLE, FÍCKLE,
TRÉMBLE, THÍMBLE.
e ante *l* solam in fine modo *u* consonans præcedat,
obscurè, vt DÍUEL, DRÍUEL, ÉUÉL, SHÓUEL.
e nunquam sonat *a*, vt ACCIDENT, non *accidant* vt Galli.
ef *f*. vt *f* Gallicum, vt FILL, FILBERT.
gee *g* ante *e* et *j* vocales vt *g* Italicum, vt GINGER, GERK.
Excipe, GIUE, cum compositis, GIRLE, GIRT, GIMLETT.
Excipe omnia etiam quæ *n* ante *g* habent, cuiusmodj sunt
omnia participia activa, vt LOUING, THRIUING, vbi 50
g enuntiatur vt γ * vt FINGER, RINGER, SING, FLING,
excipe, GINGER.

*hoc est vt *g* Germanorum.

g ante *u*. vt *gu* Gallorum, excipe LÁNGUISH, ÁNGUISH, vbi
vt *gu* Italorum.
g ante *h*, in media syllaba gutturalem reddit sonum, vt
SPRIGHT, LIGHT, AFFRIGHT, NAUGHT, TAUGHT, FRAUGHT,
RAUGHT, CAUGHT.
ach. *h* rarissimè sine aspiratione legitur; HAUING, HART, HASTIE,
HIGH.
h. spiritum addit literæ cuj coniunctum: vt THIGH. 60
h. in HONEST, HOST, HOSTESSE, HONOR, cum derivatis quiescit.
i *i* ante vocalem eiusdem syllabæ consonans, ante consonantem [f.3v]
vocalis.
i consonans sonat *g* Italicum, vt IÁUELIN, IEST, IADE, IETT,
IÉLOUS, IÓYFULL, IOYNT, IÚNKETT, IÚSTLE, IÚSTICE.
i in principio et medio dictionum vt *i* gallicum, vt ÍNTIMATE,
ÍNCIDENT.
i vocalis in fine pleniore profertur sono vt HABILITIE, vbi

bili gallicè, *tie* anglicè, <at hoc in carmine plerumque fit, sæpius enim pro *y* scribit *ie*.> 70

ka *k*. vt κ. KALENDER, KNAUE.

el *l*
em *m* } more gallico.
en *n*

o ὄμικρον habemus, et ὠμέγα, vnica tantum nota, sono differentj.

o ante duas consonantes vel densum, in principio vel medio vocabuli obscurè profertur, vt ÓFTEN, IMPÓRTUNÁTE, OTHER, BROTHER, at ante consonantem solam vt ω vt OPEN, OUER.

o in fine sj vox consonantj clauditur obscurè, vt NOT, BEGOT, SPOT, aut sj vocalis sequatur vt ω, vt NOTE, excipe clesmentia in *v* consonante et *e*, vt LOUE, MOUE, PROUE, ABOUE, BEHOUE, etc. 80

o ante *n* in fine obscurissimè, vt TOMSON, PEASON, CONTRIBÚTION, ORÁTIÒN, RÉASON.

o ante *w*, in KNOW, GROW, SNOW, SOW, ROW, FLOW, cum compositis, et in BILLOW, WILLOW, PILLOW, CROW, ELBOW, vt ω.

oo ut *ou* Gallicum, GOOD, BLOOD, FLOOD, ROOD, BROOD, MOODE.

pee *p*. ut *p* Gallorum vt PRINCESSE, PAULSGRAUE, PRETTIE.

ph. spumosiùs vt φ, PHILLIP.

qu *q* nunquam sine *u* scribitur, sonat *qu* Etruschorum, vt QUÉSTION. 90

ar *r*. vt *r* Gallicum. RUSTIC, RULE.

ess. *s*. inter duas vocales vt *z*: MUSE.

sh. vt *ch*. apud Gallos, vt SHIRT, SHEETE, LANGUISH, POLISH, <vel ut *sc* Italorum.>

tee. *t*. vt *t* Gallicum: TIDING, TILTING.

th. aliquando vt θ, aliquando vt *d* hispanicum in fine; *verdad*.

th. in medio semper vt *d* hispanicum, vt MÓTHER, BRÓTHER, ÓTHER, SMÓTHER, exceptis a Græcis originem ducentibus, vt ATHENIEN, excipe etiam hæc vocabula, METHÉGLEN, STRÉNGTHNING, LÉNGTHNING. 100

th. in fine vt θ, vt LÓUETH, PRÓUETH, SPÉAKETH, et huiusmodj [f.4] infinita. excipe pauca verba, vt TO BATHE, TO BEQUÉATH, TO CLOATH, et hæc nomina, SITHE, SHEATH, TITHE, WREATH, et VNDERNEÀTH <vbi ut *d* Hispanicum.>

th in principio vt θ, vt THÉATER, THÍRSTIE, THÍNCK, excipe, THAT, THEN, THENCE, THERE, THEY, THINE, THIS, THEISE, THOSE, THÉATHER, THOU, THOUGH.

u. inter duas consonantes vocalis, vt PULL, FULL, PULE.

in principio vocabuli ante vocalem consonans vt VEALE, 109 ante consonantem vocalis, vt VPPÒN, VPRÌGHT, VPHÒLD.

in medio inter duas vocales consonans incipitque syllabam, vt RECEIÚED.

in fine inter duas vocales quarum vltima est *e* obscurum consonans est, vt LOUE, MOUE, etc., etiam post *l* vel *r* vt TWELUE, STARUE, CARUE, etc.

u *u* consonans vt *u* gallicum vel digamam, VILLANIE, VILE.

u vocalis ante consonantem solam pronunciatur ac si interpuncta esset *j*, vt REPUTE, REFUTE, quasi REPIUTE, REFIUTE, at ante duas sonus ille *j* tollitur, vt, PUTTING, FULFILL, et huiusmodj plurima, in fine etiam ante mutam, vt BUT, PUT, SHUT, etc. 121

doble u *w* proprio quodam modo profertur, vt WILL, WÍLFULL, WÓODCOCKE,

WÍNTER, SWEARE, SWEEPE, SWEETEN, SWILL, DWELL, TWIBILL, TWENTIE, TWELUE.

w in eadem syllaba aliquando sequitur, *s*, *d*, *t*, vt in iam dictis exemplis, cum alijs consonantibus nunquam coniungitur in eadem syllaba, in diuersis vero sæpe, vt WORMEWOOD.

w post *a*, *e*, *o*, in eadem syllaba, sonat vt *u* in dipthongis *au*, *eu*, *ou*, vt THAW, SEW, NOW, quasi THAU, SEU, NOU. 130

wh. summa cum aspiratione, vt WHAT, WHETHER, WHEN, WHOM, WHO.

ex *x* vt *x* latinum, vt BOX, POX, OX.

y. *y* vt *j*. vnde sæpe scribitur pro *j*.

ezard. z ut ζ græcum.

De Dipthongis

æ vt apud Latinos.

aj } ut Italicum, vt WHAY, WAY, MAU, AUTUMNE.
au }

ea vt *e* masculinum gallicum, vt BREAD, DEAD, FEAST.

ej vt *ej* Latinum, vt THEY.

eu vt ευ græcum: GREU, DEU. 140

oa vt ω: OAKE, SMOAKE.

oj vt *oy* in *moy*, vt ANNOY, BOY, TOY.

ou apertius quam *ou* gallorum, vt THOU.

Nulla pene apud nos quiescit litera, nimirum dum distinctè loquimur. [f.4v]

Consonantes in fine dictionum durissimè efferuntur.

Derivatio et compositio non variat literarum sonum.

De Articulis.

Caput secundum.

Articulus est duplex { finitus, vt THE, *le* <vel *la* Gallicum.> / infinitus seu vagus, vt A, *un* <vel *une*.> 150

Articulus [in]finitus vim habet vt incerta et infinita declaret et definiat, vt A MAN *vn homme*, THE MAN *l'homme*.

Articulus finitus præponitur appellativis: vel generaliter, vt THE EARTH, *la terre*, vel specialiter, vt THE NÁTURE OF VÍRTUE, *la nature de vertu*.

Nomina propria et prænomina articulos recusant nisi sit emphaseōs gratia, vt THE HARRY OF HARRIES, *Henricus Henricorum*, THE ONELIE SHEE OR HEE OF THE TOWNE, *vnicus ille vel vnica illa vrbis*, vbi SHEE et HEE, pro nominibus stant, et significant, *vir*, *fæmina*. 160

Articulorum declinatio

Quæ ad contractionem attinet hic sine regulis scribemus; sic autem omnia collocamus, vt primum distinctè loquendj et scribendj modus, tum vulgaris et contractus adscribatur.

Articulus finitus. THE. *le* ou *la*. [f.5]

				Contractio
THE.	Singularis	N.	THE.	
		G.	OF THE.	OV THE vel O'THE, vel O'TH'
		D.	TO THE.	TOTH'
		A.	THE.	
		V.	Ô THE.	
		A.	FROM, BY, WITH THE.	BYTH'
	Pluralis a singulari non differt.			

167

In vulgari et contractiore loquendi forma, et apud Poetas, articulus, THE, cum nominibus à vocalj incipientibus contrahitur vt si vna pars *orationis* esset, vt THE ASSE, TH'ASSE, ὄνος; 171
THE OTHER, TH'OTHER, ἅτερος; THE IMAGE, TH'IMAGE, et hoc semper fit.
Aliquando ante *h*, cum *h*. quiescit, vt TH'HOST, TH'HONOR, TH'HONEST.

Articulus vagus. A. *un*. ou. *une*.

A.	Singularis	N.	A	
		G.	OF A.	OV A
		D.	TO A.	
		A.	A.	
		V.		
		A.	FROM, BY, WITH A.	
	Caret omnino plurali.			

177

Articulus A, si vocabulum sequens a vocalj incipiat vel *h* tenuj accipit *n*. ut hiatus tollatur, vt AN OX, AN ASSE, AN EVENING, AN HOST, AN HONEST, AN HONORABLE MAN. 180

De variatione Nominum.

Caput tertium.

Declinatio nominum fit præponendo articulos, ut

Singularis	N.	THE MAN.	TH'MAN. vbi *e* tollitur et TH' ad præcedentem dictionem iungitur vt I KNOW TH'MAN, pro I KNOW THE MAN.
	G.	OF THE MAN.	OV TH'MAN vel OTH'MAN.
	D.	TO THE MAN.	TO TH'MAN
	A.	THE MAN.	TH'MAN
	V.	Ô THE MAN	Ô TH'MAN
	A.	FROM, BY, WITH THE MAN.	FROM TH'MAN, BY TH'MAN.
Pluralis a pluralj *nominis* et *articulo* fit, vt THE MEN &c.			

185

Eodem modo variatur nomen cum articulo vago, vt A MAN, OF A MAN, TO A MAN, &c.

De genere. [f.5v]

Articuli, nomina, participia, non agnoscunt genera.
E Pronominibus HEE *ille*, et SHEE *illa*, admittunt generis distinctionem, id est, referuntur ad dictiones quibus sexus discrimen adest, vt HEE IS HEERE, *ille adest*; SHEE IS HEERE, *illa adest*. 190

De Numero.

Articulis, adiectivis, participijs idem est singularis et pluralis, vt THE MAN, THE MEN, HÓNEST MAN, HÓNEST MEN, LÓUING MAN, LÓUING MEN, LÓUED MAN, LÓUED MEN.
Substantiuorum pluralis fit addendo *s*. singularj, vt HANDE, HANDES, STONE, STONES, BONE, BONES.
Finita in *i* vel *y*, in *ss*, in *s* consonante præcedente, et in *x*, accipiunt *e* in pluralj, vt INFÍRMITIE, INFÍRMITIES. CHÁRITY, CHÁRITYES. HARDINES, HARDINESSES. PURSE, PURSES. BOX, BOXES. 200
Quæ *f*. habent in fine *f* vertunt in *v* consonante, ut CALF, CALVS. BEEF, BEEVS. THEEF, THEEVS. KNIFE, KNIVS. WIFE, WIUES. LIFE, LIVES.
Hæc sunt irregularia, MAN, MEN; WÓMAN, WÓMEN; SOW, *truye*, SWINE; OX, *bœuf*, OXEN; BEE, *mouche a miel*, BEEN; MOUSE, *souris*, MISE; TOOTH, *dens*, TEETH; LOUSE, *poux*, LISE; FOOTE, *pied*, FEETE; COW, *vache*, KINE; CHILDE, CHILDREN.

De Nominum analogia. 210

Caput quartum.

De Adiectivis.

lesse. Addendo syllabam LESSE substantivi fini, fit adiectiuum significationis contrariæ redditque apud Græcos α στερητικὸν, vt FEARLESSE ἄφοβος, HARMELESSE ἄκακος, FATHERLESSE, MOTHERLESSE, BROTHERLESSE, MONYLESSE.
un. <Syllaba UN in principio vim στερητικὴν obtinet α ut à FAINED *feint* fit VNFAINED, *non feint*. FAITHFULNESSE *fidelitas*. UNFAITHFULNESS, *infidelitas*. reperiuntur aliæ formæ στερητικαὶ in eadem voce. possumus dicere UNHARMLESS ἀάατος vel ἐκ ἄκακος. at tales formæ non sunt frequentes licet linguæ analogia hanc libertatem ferre queat.> 220
full. Si FULL substantiuo adiungas, fiet adiectiuum eiusdem sensus, plenitudinem quandam significans, vt HÓPEFULL; FULL enim valet *plenum*: vt FEÁREFULL, HARMEFULL, SINFULL, GUILEFULL, MINDEFULL, *memor*. [f.6]
ly LY in fine substantiui adiectiuum eiusdem significationis facit; LI a *like* similis; vnde in LY finita similitudinem significant: vt LOUELY, FATHERLY, MOTHERLY, BROTHERLY, SISTERLY, FREINDLY. 230
y. Y in fine substantiui adiectiuum eiusdem sensus: vt WATER *aqua*, WÁTERY *aquosus*, AERY, EARTHY, STONY, FIERY.
en. EN substantivo adiunctum adiectivum facit materiale, vt

BEECH *fagus*, BEECHEN *faginus*, OAK *ilex*, OÁKEN *ilignum*, GOLD *aurum*, GOLDEN *aureus*.

some — Syllaba SOME addita substantivo vel adiectivo sensum retinet. vt BRIGHT *clarus* BRIGHTSOME, LIGHT *lucidus* LIGHTSOME, GLADSOME, NOYSOME.

ish. — ISH substantivo datum fit adiectiuum sensumque retinet. vt WATER *WÁTERISH*, SALT *SÁLTISH*, FOOLE FOÓLISH, CHILDE CHÍLDISH, SLUT SLÚTTISH. 240

Datum vero adiectivo, sensum diminuit, vt RED *rufus*, RÉDDISH *subrufus*; BITTER *amarus*, BÍTTERISH *subamarus*; SWEETISH, YELLOWISH, WHITISH.

De substantivis.

nesse. — Addimus syllabam, NESSE, adiectivo et fit substantivum sensus eiusdem, vt FEARELESNESSE ἀφοβία, HARMELESNESSE ἀκακία, MOTHERLESNESSE τὸ ἀμητορ, FATHERLESNES, HOPEFULLNESSE εὐελπισία, FEAREFULNESSE *meticulositas*, LOUELIENESSE, 250 FATHERLINESSE *paternitas*, FREINDLINESSE τὸ φιλικὸν, EARTHINESSE τὸ γηϊνὸν, STONYNESSE τὸ λιθινὸν, BRIGHTSOME-NESSE *claritudo*, GLADSOMENESSE τὸ χαρτικὸν, SALTISHNESSE ἁλμυρότης, BITTERISHNESSE ὑποπικροτης.

Idem accidit adiectivis principalibus, vt WHITE, WHITENESSE [f.6v] *albedo*, GOOD *bonus*, GOODNES *bonitas*, LIGHT *levis*, LIGHTNESSE *leuitas*, SMOOTH *lœuis*, SMOOTHNESSE *lœuitas*.

full — Vocabula quæ continere aliquid possunt accepto FULL fiunt substantiua mensuram significantia, vt SPOONE *cochleare*, SPOONEFULL *cochlearium*, HANDE HANDEFULL *poignée*, HOUSE 260 *maison*, HÓUSEFULL, TÓWNEFULL, SHIPFULL, SPIT *veru* SPITFULL.

Vocabula vero quæ continerj possunt vel re vel cogitatione addito FULL fiunt adiectiua vt supra, FEAREFULL, DISDAINEFULL quæ forma optime quadrat vocibus affectiones vel aliquod simile significantibus, vt HÓPEFULL, SPÍTEFULL, ÍREFULL, GUÍLEFULL.

hood vel head — HOOD, vel HEAD addita substantivis qualitatem notat, vt MÁNHOOD *virilitas*, WÓMANHOOD *fœminea virtus*, KNÍGHTHOOD *la cheualerie*, PRÉISTHOOD *sacerdotium*; aliquando 270 adiectivis vt LIVELYHOOD <*viuacitas*,> BEASTLYHEAD <*bestialité*.>

shipp — SHIP nominis cauda officium vel munus denotans, vt CÓNSULSHIP *cónsulatus*, PRÁETORSHIPPE, CÉNSORSHIPPE, WÓRSHIP *dignitas*, LÓRDSHIP *signiorie*.

dome. — Est altera forma terminationis, vt KINGDOME *regnum*, EARLEDOME *counté*.

De verbalibus.

Dicuntur a themate verborum definentium in vocalem addendo *r*, in consonantem *er*, vt TO LOUE *amare*, A LÓUER *amator*; TO DISPÛTE, 280 A DIṢPÚTER; TO SING, A SÍNGER; TO CRY, A CRYER; TO HURT, A HÚRTER; TO KNOCKE, A KNÓCKER; TO QUAFFE, A QUAFFER; TO HUNT, A HUNTER.

Quædam in MENT finiunt, a verbis in *dge*, *sh*, *ise*, vel *ze* finitis, vt JÚDGEMENT, ABRÍDGEMENT, BÁNISHMENT, RÁUISHMENT, PÚNISHMENT,

IMPÓUERISHMENT, DISGUÍSEMENT, AMÁZEMENT.

De Analogia adverbiorum. [f.7]

Adverbia ab adiectivis principalibus formantur appositione LY fini: vt HÓNEST HÓNESTLY, MÓDEST MÓDESTLIE, FINE FÍNELY *brauement*, TRUE TRULY *vrayement*. formantur etiam a deriuatis, vt FRÉINDLESLY, FÉAREFULLY, ÉARTHYLY, LÍGHTSOMELY, SÁLTISHLY, RÉDDISHLY, WÓODDENLY, GÓODLILY, FRÉINDLILY. Fiunt etiam a Participijs activus, vt LÓUINGLY, STÉALINGLY, et sæpe a passivis, vt AMAZEDLY. 290

De gradibus comparationis.

Comparantur recta et regularia in ER, superlativa in EST. hac vero forma adiectiva, participia, adverbia, abundè fruuntur.

adiect.	HÓPEFULL	HÓPEFULLER	HÓPEFULLEST	per	HOPEFUL'ST
Part. act.	LÓUING	LÓUINGER	LÓUINGEST	contrac-	LOUING'ST
Part. pass.	LÉARNED	LÉARNEDER	LÉARNEDEST	tionem	LEARNED'ST
Adverb.	PÓORELY	PÓORELIER	PÓORELIEST		

Aliter comparantur cum MORE *plus*, et LESSE *minus*, vel TOO MUCH *nimium*, TOO LITTLE *nimis parum*, quorum superlativum est MOST, exempli gratia: 302

HOPEFULL	MORE HOPEFULL	MOST HOPEFULL
HOPEFULL	LESSE HOPEFULL	LEAST HOPEFULL

Quæ sequuntur sunt irregularia:

ἄγαθος	GOOD	BETTER	BEST	βέλτερος	βέλτιστος
κακὸς	BAD	WORSE vel WÓRSER	WORST		
μικρὸς	LITTLE	LESSE vel LESSER	LEAST		

<alia forma superlativorum

VPPER	VPPERMOST
HIGHER	HIGHERMOST
VNDER	VNDERMOST
	NETHERMOST
LOWER	LOWERMOST
FORMER	FORMOST
πρῶτος	πρώτιστος>

310

De Diminitivis.

Raro admittimus diminitiva nisj in nominibus proprijs quorum vsus frequens ut RICHARD DICKE, THOMAS TOM, WILLIAM WILL, ROBERT ROBIN, &c. <CHRISTOFER KIT,> ELIZABETH BESSE, CATHERINE CATE, &c.

Aliquando in Appellativis vt LAMB LAMBKIN, BULL BULCHIN vel BULLOCKE, CHICK CHICKEN, GOOSE GOSLING, DUCKE DUCKLING, SUCKLING, DEARE DARLING, STARE STARELING, CÁPON CÁPONET. 320

Pronomina [illegible] … [illegible] — Contracte [illegible]

I

- Sing.
  - N. I
  - G. of me — ommee
  - D. to me — tommee
  - A. me
  - V. [illegible]
  - A. from, by, with me — wimmee vel wummee
- Pl.
  - N. we
  - G. of us — ous
  - D. to us
  - A. us
  - V.
  - A. from, by, with us

Thou

- Sing.
  - N. thou
  - G. of thee — o thee vel othee
  - D. to thee
  - A. thee
  - V. o thee
  - A. from, by, with thee
- Pl.
  - N. you vel ye
  - G. of you — oyou vel o you
  - D. to you
  - A. you
  - V. o you
  - A. from, by, with you — wit you

He

- Sing.
  - N. hee
  - G. of him — o'him vel on'im
  - D. to him — to'im
  - Ac. him — 'im
  - V.
  - A. from, by, with him — from'im, by'im, with'im
- Plur.
  - N. they
  - G. of them — o them, othem, of'em, vel on'em
  - D. to them — to'em
  - A. them — 'em
  - V.
  - A. from, by, with them — from'em, by'em, with'em

She

- Sing.
  - N. shee
  - G. of her — o'er
  - D. to her — to'er
  - A. her — 'er
  - V. o shee
  - A. from, by, with her — from her, by'er, with'er
- Pluralis non differt a plurali hee.

[illegible] compositionem self his Pronominibus, ut I my self, thou thy self, he himself, genit. of me my self, of thee thy self, of him himself.
Plur. wee our selves, you your selves, they themselves. Genit. of us our selves &c. of you your selves, of them themselves &c. in obliquis.

Possessiva.
- Praepositiva. my, thy, his. Plur. our, your, their.
- Subjunctiva mine, thine, his. Plur. ours, yours, theirs.

Cum [illegible] a vocali incipit utimur subjunctivis praepositivorum vice, ut mine aunt, mine uncle; at solum in numero singulari fit.
Possessiva [illegible] … tailes. [illegible] &c.
Protocabulum which vel that [illegible] quod refertur ad res et personas
who [illegible] solum refertur ad [illegible] ut the man who loves you, vir qui te amat, nunquam autem [illegible] dicimus the stone who is hard, sed the stone which vel that is hard, sa[illegible] … est
[illegible] aliquis habet whom, ut of whom, to whom, whom, from by with whom.
Whose reddit cujus vel quorum, ut whose booke is this, cujus est hic liber.

BL MS Royal 12.F.xviii, f.7v.

De Pronomine. [f.7v]

Caput [quintum].

Demonstrativa sunt I, THOU, HEE, SHEE.

		Casus		<Contractio.>	
I.	Singularis	N.	I.		
		G.	OF MEE.	ÓMMEE.	
		D.	TO MEE.	TÓMMEE.	
		A.	MEE		
		V.	Ô MEE		
		A.	FROM, BY, WITH MEE.	WÍMMEE vel WÚMMEE	324
	Pluralis	N.	WEE.		
		G.	OF VS.	OV VS.	
		D.	TO VS.		
		A.	VS.		
		V.			
		A.	FROM, BY, WITH VS		
THOU.	Singularis	N.	THOU		
		G.	OF THEE.	OV THEE vel O'THEE	
		D.	TO THEE.		
		A.	THEE.		
		V.	Ô THEE.		
		A.	FROM, BY, WITH THEE.		325
	Pluralis	N.	YOU vel YEE.		
		G.	OF YOU.	O'YOU vel OV YOU.	
		D.	TO YOU.		
		A.	YOU.		
		V.	Ô YOU.		
		A.	FROM, BY, WITH YOU.	WEE-YOU.	
HEE.	Singularis	N.	HEE.		
		G.	OF HIM.	OV'HIM vel ON'IM.	
		D.	TO HIM.	TO'IM.	
		AC.	HIM	IM	
		V.			
		A.	FROM, BY, WITH HIM.	FROM'IM, BY'IM, WITH'IM.	326
	Pluralis	N.	THEY.		
		G.	OF THEM.	OV THEM, O'THEM, OF'EM, vel ON'EM.	
		D.	TO THEM.	TO'EM.	
		A.	THEM.	'EM.	
		V.			
		A.	FROM, BY, WITH THEM.	FROM'EM, BY'EM, WITH'EM.	
SHEE.	Singularis	N.	SHEE		
		G.	OF HER.	OV'ER.	
		D.	TO HER.	TO'ER.	
		A.	HER	'ER	
		V.	Ô SHEE.		
		A.	FROM, BY, WITH HER.	FROM'ER, BY'ER, WITH'ER.	327
	Pluralis non differt a plurali THEY.				

Addimus epitagmaticon MY SELF hisce Pronominibus, vt I MY SELF, THOU THY SELF, HEE HIM SELF, genitivo OF MEE MY SELF, OF THEE THY SELF, OF HIM HIM SELF. Pluralis WEE OUR SELUES, YOU YOUR SELUES, THEY THEM SELUES. Genitivo OF VS OUR SELUES &c., OF YOU YOUR SELUES, OF THEM THEM SELUES etc, in obliquis. 330

Possessiua. { Præpositiva, MY, THY, HIS, pluralis OUR, YOUR, THEIRE.
Subiunctiva, MYNE, THYNE, HIS, pluralis OURS, YOURS, THEIRES.

Cum vox sequens a vocali incipit vtimur subiunctivis præpositivorum vice, vt MINE AUNT, MINE VNCLE, at hic solum in numero singularj fit.
Possessivum nunquam recipit articulum vt apud Gallos. *le mien* etc.
Provocabulum WHICH vel THAT, reddit *qui quæ quod* referturque ad res et personas.
WHO vero solum refertur ad personam, vt THE MAN WHO LOUES YOU, *vir qui te amat*, nunquam ad res non enim dicimus THE STONE WHO IS HARD, sed THE STONE WHICH vel THAT IS HARD, *saxum quod durum est*. 340
WHO in obliquis habet WHOM, vt OF WHOM, TO WHOM, WHOM, FROM, BY, WITH WHOM.
<WHOSE reddit *cujus* vel *quorum*, ut WHOSE BOOKE IS THIS. *cujus est hic liber*.>
THIS singularis, *ce*. THEIS pluralis, *ces*. THAT *illud*. THOSE *illa*. [f.8]
HIS post substantivum possessionem significat, vt VIRGILL HIS LIFE, *Virgilij vita*, SCǍEUOLA HIS HAND, *manus Scæuolæ*, CAESAR HIS COMENTARY etc. quod in scripta oratione sæpe, et cum loquimur, semper contrahitur cum substantivo, hoc modo, VIRGIL'S LIFE, SCÁEVOLA'S HAND, CAESAR'S COMENTARY, CASAUBON'S POLIBIUS, at post nomina *s* finita, sic, POLIBIUS'US HISTORIE, CALUDIUS'IS MESSALINA, PLAUTUS'IS COMOEDIES. 350
<THEAROF reddit Gallorum *en*, ut HEE HATH EATEN THEAREOF. *il en a mangé*.>

De Verbo.

Caput [sextum].

Vnica nobis verborum coniugatio a qua quæ deflectunt verba, sunt anomala. 360
In regularibus thema prius considerandum est, dein aoristum et participium passiuum: a quo facta sunt præterita tempora.
Aoristum verborum regularium fit a themate addendo *d* si litera vltima fuerit vocalis, vt TO LOUE *amare*, aoristum I LOUED *amauj*, sin consonans, *ed*, vt TO OMITT, aoristum I OMITTED.
Litera Characteristica nunquam mutantur.
Adiunguntur semper verbis personæ.
Terminatio personarum pluralium non diffidet a prima singulari.
<Passiuum fit a participio passivo et verbo substantivo, ut I AM LOVED, *je suis aimé*. I AM HURT, *je suis blessé*.> 370

j'aime — Contractionis ratio [f.8v]

Præsens
- primum
  - Singularis: I LOUE; THOU LOUEST; HEE LOUETH — THOU LOU'ST; HEE LOU'S
  - Pluralis: WEE, YOU, THEY } LOUE — THE LOUE
- secundum
  - Singularis: I DOE; THOU DOST; HEE DOTH
  - Pluralis: WEE, YOU, THEY } DOE
  - } LOUE

373

Promiscuè vtimur duplici huius temporis forma, at sæpius prima, secunda vero cum emphaticōs loquimur, vel in interrogationibus.

j'aymay
Imperfectum
- Singularis: I DID; THOU DIDST; HEE DID
- Pluralis: WEE, YOU, THEY } DID
- } LOUE

376

j'aymay
Aoristum
- Singularis: I LÓUED; THOU LÓUEDST; HEE LOUED — I LOU'D; THOU LOU'DST; HEE LOU'd
- Pluralis: WEE, YOU, THEY } LOUED

377

Hoc tempus aoristum Græcum vel Gallicum reddit: vt I MADE ἐποίησα, *je fis.*

j'ai aimé
Præteritum Perfectum
- Singularis: I HAUE; THOU HAST; HEE HATH
- Pluralis: WEE, YOU, THEY } HAUE
- } LOUED
- I'A; THOU'AST vel breuius TH'AST; HEE HAS vel HEE'AS; WEE, YOU, THEY } A — Y'A; TH'A } LOU'D

380

Hoc tempus vim præteriti perfecti Græcj vel Gallicj retinet, vt I HAVE MADE πεποίηκα *j'ay fait.*

j'auoy aymé [f.9]
plusquam Perfectum
- Singularis: I HAD; THOU HADST; HEE HAD
- pluralis: WEE, YOU, THEY } HAD
- } LOUED.
- I'AD; THOU'ADST — TH'ADST; HEE'AD — HEE'D; WEE, YOU, THEY } AD — WEE'D; YA'D; TH'AD } LOU'D

383

<j'ajmeray>

futurum primum					
singularis	I WILL	LOUE.	I'LE	LOUE.	384
	THOU WILT		THOU'LT		
	HEE WILL		HEE'LE		
pluralis	WEE WILL		WEE'LE		
	YOU WILL		YOU'LE		
	THEY WILL		THEY'LE		

In prima persona singularj et pluralj semper voluntas agendj significatur; in cæteris, modo voluntas, modo simplex futuri temporis eventus, vt HEE WILL COME, *il viendra*, HEE WILL BEE HANGED, *il veult estre pendu*; primum: *il sera pendu*.

futurum secundum				
singularis	I SHALL	LOUE.	Prima persona vtriusque numerj subseruit promissis reliquæ nunquam.	389
	THOU SHALT			
	HEE SHALL			
pluralis	WEE SHALL			
	YOU SHALL			
	THEY SHALL			

Hoc futurum necessitatem, certitudinem eventus, omnibus personis et numeris enunciat: sæpe imperativj vim obtinet.
Secunda et tertia persona vtriusque numerj subserviunt promissis et imperijs, prima vero nunquam. At Scotj aliter: qui cum dicerent I WILL LOVE, dicunt I SHALL LOUE YOU.

futurum tertium					
singularis	I SHALL	HAVE LOUED.	I SHALL'A	LOU'D.	395
	THOU SHALT		THOU SHALT'A vel SHAT'A		
	HEE SHALL		HEE SHALL'A etc.		
pluralis	WEE SHALL				
	YOU SHALL				
	THEY SHALL				

Fit a futuro verbi HAUE et participio præteritj: vnde significatio mixta est, gallicè *j'auray aimé*, I SHALL HAUE WRITTEN γεγραφὼς ἔσομαι et interrogatiué, SHALL ONE HAUE SENT SO MANY TO HELL? *vnus tot miserit orco*?

Imperativus. 400

aime: qu'il aime			
singularis	LOUE.		
	LET HIM LOUE.	LET IM LOUE.	
pluralis	LET VS LOUE.	LET'S LOUE.	
	LOUE YOU		
	LET THEM LOUE.	LET EM LOUE.	

LET HIM LOUE, verbatim, *sine illum amare*.

Optativus. [f.9v]

ie prie dieu que i'aime. I PRAY GOD Præsens			
singularis	I	LOUE.	404
	THOU		
	HEE		
pluralis	WEE		
	YOU		
	THEY		

Imperfectum: vt aoristum indicativj vt I WOULD TO GOD, vel I WOULD (per contractionem I WUD) I LOUED, *vtinam amarem*, &c.
Perfectum vt perfectum indicativj: I PRAY GOD I HAUE LOUED, *vtinam amauerim*.
Plusquam perfectum vt plusquam perfectum indicativj: I WOULD TO GOD, vel I WOULD I HAD LOUED *vtinam amauissem*. 410
futurum vt præsens, addendo, HEEREAFTER, *cy-apres*, vt I PRAY GOD I LOUE HEEREAFTER.

Modus Potentialis, potentiam, permissionem, vel casum quendam enuntiat.

præsens primum
- singularis: I CAN / THOU CANST / HEE CAN — LOUE.
- pluralis: WEE / YOU / THEY CAN — LOUE. 415

I CAN LOUE verbatim, *possum amare*, potentiam enim prima hæc forma nunciat: vt *nec sperent Tartara regem*, HELL CANNOT EXPECT A KING.

præsens secundum
- singularis: I MAY / THOU MAIST / HEE MAY — LOUE.
- pluralis: WEE / YOU / THEY MAY — LOUE. 419

Hæc forma permissionis vim habet, vt *expectes hoc a me*; THOU MAIST EXPECT THIS OF ME. primum, *Liceat tibi hoc* etc. vel *potes* etc. I MAY SPEAKE THE TRUTH, *Licet mihi loqui veritatem*: HEE MAY DOE MEE GOOD, hic casum significat.

Imperfectum
- primum
  - singularis: I COULD / THOU COULDST / HEE COULD — LOUE. (I COU'D / THOU COU'DST / HEE COU'D)
  - pluralis: WEE / YOU / THEY COULD — LOUE.

  Fit a prima forma præsentis, eandemque vim tenet quoad significationem, vt I COULD SAY *dicerem* vel *poteram dicere*. 424
- secundum
  - singularis: I MIGHT / THOU MIGHTST / HEE MIGHT — LOUE.
  - pluralis: WEE / YOU / THEY MIGHT — LOUE.

  Fit a secunda forma præsentis, eiusque significationem retinet permissivam vel fortuitam.

Perfectum
- primum: I CAN HAUE LOUED. I CAN A LOU'D [f.10]
  THOU CANST HAUE LOUED etc. vt tempus præsens, HAUE et participio additis.
- secundum: I MAY HAUE LOUED etc. vt præsens, HAUE cum participio addito.

I CAN HAUE LOUED, *possum amasse, amaverim.*
I MAY HAUE LOUED, fortè an *amaverim.*

plusquam perfectum
- primum
  - singularis: I COULD / THOU COULDST / HEE COULD — HAUE LOUED.
  - pluralis: WEE / YOU / THEY COULD — HAUE LOUED. 430

  fit ab imperfecto primo addito HAUE cum participio.
  I COULD HAUE LOUED, *amauissem*, vel *poteram amavisse.*
- secundum: I MIGHT / THOU MIGHTST etc. vt imperfectum: apposito HAUE cum participio.

I MIGHT HAUE KILLED HIM, *licuerat mihi illum occidisse.*

futurum: a præsenti non discrepat, vt I MAY LOUE HEEREAFTER, I CAN LOUE HEEREAFTER.

Subiunctivus.

Præsens: vt præsens optativi: vt THOUGH I LOUE, ALTHOUGH I LOUE *quamvis amem.* 435

Imperfectum (*j'aimeroy*)
- primum
  - singularis: I WOULD / THOU WOULDST / HEE WOULD — LOUE. I WOO'D / THOU WU'DST / HEE WU'D; I'DE / THOU'DST / HEE'D — LOUE.
  - pluralis: WEE / YOU / THEY WOULD — LOUE. WEE WU'D / YOU WU'D / THEY WU'D; WEE'D / YOU'D / THEY'D — LOUE.

  I WOULD SPEAKE *je parleroy, vellem loquj*: formatur a primo futuro indicativi, a WILL, WOULD. 437
  THOUGH I WOULD LOUE *quamvis amarem*, vel *quam vis vellem amare.*
- secundum
  - singularis: I SHOULD / THOU SHOULDST / HEE SHOULD — LOUE. I SHU'D / THOU SHU'DST / HEE SHU'D — LOUE.
  - pluralis: WEE / YOU / THEY SHOULD — LOUE. WEE / YOU / THEY SHU'D — LOUE.

  THOUGH I SHOULD LOUE, *quamvis deberem amare*, THOU SHOULDST LABOR, *deberes laborare*, YOU SHOULD SPEAKE, *vous deuriez parler.* 440

Perfectum et plusquam perfectum

primum:
- I WOULD HAUE LOUED etc. fit ab imperfecto addito HAUE et participio. [f.10v]
- I WOULD HAVE BELEIUED *Crediderim* vel *credidissem*; I WOULD HAUE SAID, *dixerim*.
- I WOULD HAUE GRANTED *Concesserim*: voluntatem semper indicat, vt I WOULD HAUE GIUEN *volueram dare*. 441

secundum:
- I SHOULD HAUE LOUED, THOU SHOULDEST HAUE LOUED, HEE SHOULD HAUE LOUED etc.
- fit ab imperfecto addito HAUE et participio, indicatio semper est debitj, vt I SHOULD HAUE LOUED, *debueram amare*, THOU SHOULDST HAUE IMITATED, *debueras imitarj*, vel *imitatus esses*.

Infinitivus.

præsens et imperfectum: TO LOUE *amare*.
perfectum et plusquam perfectum: TO HAUE LOUED *amavisse*.
futurum: TO LOUE HEEREAFTER. 445
<participium activum:> LOUING fit a themate addendo ING. si in consonantem definat, vt TO HELP, HELPING *adiuuans*. sin in vocalem, reijce vocalem et adde ING, vt LOUE LOU~~E~~ING, MOUE MOU~~E~~ING.
Participium passivum: LOUED, in regularibus non discrepat ab aoristo.

De verbo substantivo, I AM, *sum*, a quo cum participio passiuo, omnia verba passiva facta sunt: vt I AM LOUED *amor*, I WAS LOUED *amabar* etc.

Indicativus.

je suis præsens

singularis	I AM		
	THOU ART	TH'ART	
	HEE IS	HEE'S	455
pluralis	WEE ARE		
	YOU ARE	Y'ARE	
	THEY ARE	TH'ARE	

j'estoy vel *je fus* imperfectum et aoristum

singularis	I WAS	
	THOU WAST	
	HEE WAS	456
pluralis	WEE / YOU / THEY WERE	

j'ay esté [f.11]
perfectum: I HAUE BENE, THOU HAST BENE, HEE HATH BENE etc.
plusquam perfectum: I HAD BENE, THOU HADST BENE, HEE HAD BENE etc.
je seray futurum: *j'auray esté*
- primum: I WILBEE, THOU WILT BEE, HEE WILBEE etc.
- secundum: I SHALBEE, THOU SHALT BEE, HEE SHALBEE etc.
- tertium: I WILL vel SHALL HAUE BENE, THOU WILT vel SHALT HAUE BENE, HEE WILL vel SHALL HAUE BENE etc. 460

Imperativus.

soys. BEE THOU, LET HIM BEE, LET VS BEE, BEE YOU, LET THEM BEE.

vtinam sim Optativus.

præsens: I PRAIE GOD I BEE, THOU BEE vel BEEST, HEE BEE, WEE BEE, YOU BEE, THEY BEE.
imperfectum: *essem* I WOULD I WERE, THOU WER'ST vel WEART, HEE WEARE, WEE WEARE, YOU WEARE, THEY WEARE.
perfectum: *fuerim* I PRAY GOD I HAUE BENE, THOU HAST BENE etc.
plusquam perfectum: *fuissem* WOULD I HAD BENE, THOU HADST BENE etc.
futurum: *fuero*: PRAY GOD I BEE HEEREAFTER, THOU BEEST HEEREAFTER etc.

Potentialis. 471

præsens { primum: I CAN BEE, THOU CANST BEE, HEE CAN BEE, WEE CAN BEE etc.
secundum: I MAY BEE, THOU MAIST BEE, HEE MAY BEE, WEE MAY BEE etc.

imperfectum { primum: I COULD BEE, THOU COULDST BEE, HEE COULD BEE, WEE COULD BEE etc.
secundum: I MIGHT BEE, THOU MIGHTST BEE, HEE MIGHT BEE, WEE MIGHT BEE etc.

perfectum { primum: I CAN HAUE BENE, THOU CANST HAUE BENE, HEE CAN HAUE BENE, WEE CAN HAUE BENE etc.
secundum: I MAY HAUE BENE, THOU MAYST HAUE BENE, HEE MAY HAUE BENE, WEE MAY HAUE BENE etc.

plusquam perfectum { primum: I COULD HAUE BENE, THOU COULDST HAUE BENE, HEE COULD HAUE BENE, WEE COULD HAUE BENE etc.
secundum: I MIGHT HAUE BENE, THOU MIGHTST HAUE BENE, HEE MIGHT HAUE BENE, WEE MIGHT HAUE BENE etc. 475

futurum { primum: I CAN BEE HEEREAFTER, THOU CANST BEE HEEREAFTER.
secundum: I MAY BEE HEEREAFTER, THOU MAYST BEE HEEREAFTER.

Subiunctivus.

Præsens: THOUGH I BEE, THOUGH THOU BEEST vel BEE, HEE BEE, WEE BEE etc.
imperfectum: THOUGH I WEARE, THOU WEARST vel WEART, HEE WEARE, WEE WEARE, YOU WEARE, THEY WEARE. 480
Imperfectum proprium Subjunctivo: THOUGH I WOULD BEE, THOU WOULDST BEE, HEE WOULD BEE, WEE WOULD BEE etc.
THOUGH I SHOULD BEE, THOU SHOULDST BEE, HEE SHOULD BEE, WEE SHOULD BEE etc.
THOUGH I WOULD HAUE BENE, THOU WOULDST HAUE BENE, HEE WOULD HAUE BENE.
THOUGH I SHOULD HAUE BENE, THOU SHOULDST HAUE BENE, HEE SHOULD HAUE BENE.

Infinitus. 490

præsens et imperfectum: TO BEE *estre.*

perfectum et plusquamperfectum: TO HAUE BENE <*auoir esté.*>
participium activum: BEEING *estant.*
participium passivum: BEENE vel BIN.

Verba apud latinos cum Præpositionibus composita interpretamur, [f.11v]
Præpositionis significatum ponendo post verbum, vt *abeo*,
I GOE AWAY, vel I GOE FROM, *adeo* I GOE VNTÒ, *ineo* I GOE
INTÒ, *exeo* I GOE OUT, *circumeo* I GOE ABOUT, *subeo* I GOE
VNDER, *colloquor* I SPEAKE WITH, *concurro* I RUNNE TOGEATHER,
disrumpo I BREAKE ASUNDER, *refero* I BRING AGAINE, *superaddo* 500
I ADDE MOREOUER, *supercurro* I RUNNE VPON, *impono* I SETT
VPON, *obiaceo* I LY BEFORE etc.

Ouer — OUER solum, valet *super* et *trans*, at in compositione qua cum
omnibus fere verbis coagmentatur vincendj vel superandj
vim habet, vt TO OVERGÒE *eundo superare*, TO OUER-REÀD
legendo superare, TO OUERSHOÒTE iaculando superare, TO
OUERSPEÀKE *loquendo superare* et id genus infinita.

Out — Eundem quoque sensum habet et OUT, vt TO OUTRÌDE
equitando superare, TO OUTLEÀP *saltando superare* etc.

OUER etiam excessum agendi vult, vt TO OUERPRAÌSE *nimis* 510
laudare, TO OVERPRÌSE *pluris rem æstimare quam valet*,
TO OUERSÈLL *rem pluris quam quanti valet vendere*, TO
OUERSTÙDDY *studere nimis*, TO OUER-REÀD *legere nimis*, et
huiusmodj sexcenta; eundem sensum et OUT.

vnder — VNDER contrarium significat. TO VNDERSÈLL *minoris vendere*
quam quantj est: huiusmodj verbis accusativum, vel
substantivum vel pronomen cum SELF addimus vt HEE OUER-
RÉADETH HIMSELFE, *nimium legit*. HEE OUERPLOUGHETH THE
OXEN *facit vt boues nimis arent*, HEE OUERLABOURETH HIS
SERVANTS *facit vt servj nimis laborent*. <atque hic 520
prægnantem significatum habet ut apud Latinos et
Græcos.>

with — WITH valet *cum*. at in composito, *nunc de*, vt TO WITHDRAW
deducere, WITHHOLD *detinere nunc contra*, vt TO WITH-
STAND. raro cum alijs componitur.

vn — UN reddit verbum cum quo componitur contrarij significatus,
vt TO FOLD *plicare*, TO VNFOLD *displicare*. TO CLOTHE
induere, TO VNCLOTHE *exuere*, quam formam compositionis
omnia recipiunt verba.

Mis — MIS in compositione obliquè vel malè significat: vt TO 530
MISINTERPRET *male interpretarj*, TO MISLEAD *male ducere*,
aliquando cum nominibus vt MISHAP *mala fortuna*.

Supinum primum latinorum redditur aliquando ab infinitivo,
vt *eo visum* I GOE TO SEE, aliquando a Participio activo
cum *a* vt *eo venatum* I GOE A HUNTING, *piscatum eo* I GOE
A FISHING, *eunt bibitum* THEY GOE A DRINKING, *eunt*
stellas speculatum THEY GOE A STARRE GAZING.

en — Ab adiectivis fiunt verba sæpissimè addendo, EN, vt SWEETE
doulx, TO SWEETEN *addoucir*, SHARPE *acutum*, TO SHARPEN
acuere, et huiusmodj infinita. 540

Fiunt etiam a substantivis pene omnibus, vt A HEAD *Caput*,
TO HEAD *caput imponere* (at TO BEEHEAD significat
decollare), A FINGER *digitus*, TO FINGER *digitis*
attrectare, A HAND *manus*, TO HANDLE *tractare*, SILVER
argentum, TO SILVER, A BOORD *table*, TO BOORD *recevoir*

en pension.

Horum verborum Participia passiva frequentèr vsurpantur, vt A MAN WELL LANDED, *vn homme qui a beaucoup de terre,* LAND WELL WATERED *terre la ou il y a beaucoup d'eau,* A COUNTRIE WELL MEADOWED, WEEE WOODDED, WELL TOWN'D, (550) WELL VILLAGED, *vn pais plein de prés, de bois, de villes, de villages,* et huiusmodj innumerabilia.

On ON post verbum significat continuationem actionis vt TO SPEAKE ON *loqui pergere.* Aliquando idem ac *vppon,* vt TO SETT ON <*imponere* ἐπιτιθέναι>

bee BEE in compositis auget significationem, vt TO BEWAILE [f.12] *lamentarj,* TO BETHINKE *cogitare,* TO BESMEARE *inungo,* TO BEETAKE, vt HEE BETAKETH HIMSELF TO HIS BOOKE *omnino se dedicat literis,* TO BESPITT *conspuere,* TO FOULE *spurcare,* TO BEEFOULE *conspurcare,* et sic in cæteris. (560)

Anomala ordine Alphabeti descripta.

	Thema	Aoristum	Participium		
A	ABIDE	ABODE	ABIDDEN	*remanere*	
	ARISE	ARÒSE	ARÍSEN	*surgere*	
	AWAKE	AWOOKE / AWOKE / AWAKED	AWAKED	<*experge fierj*>	565
B	BACKEBITE	BACKEBÌTT	BACKEBÍTTEN	*calumniarj,* verbatim *dorsum mordere.*	
	BEARE	BORE	BORNE	*ferre* vel *parere*	
	BEAT	BEET	BEÁTEN	*verberare*	
	BEGÌN	BEGÀN	BEGÒN	*incipere*	
	BEHOÙLD	BEHÈLD	BEHÈLD / BEHOLDEN	*contemplari* vel *aspicere*	570
	BEND	BENT	BENT / BÉNDED	*intendere*	
	BEEREÀUE	BEERÈFT	BEERÈFT	*auferre*	
	BIDD	BAD	BÌDDEN	*iubere*	
	BINDE	BOUND	BOUND	*vincire*	
	BITE	BITT	BITTEN	*mordere*	
	BLEEDE	BLED	BLED	*cruentari* vel <*mittere sanguine*>	
	BLOW	BLEW	BLOWEN	*flare*	
	BREAKE	BROKE	BROKEN	*rumpere*	
	BREED	BRED	BRED	*procreare*	
	BRING	BROUGHT	BROUGHT	*afferre*	580
	BUILD	BUILT	BUILT	*ædificare*	
	BUY	BOUGHT	BOUGHT	*emere*	
C	CAN	COULD	BENE ABLE	*posse*	
	CATCH	CAUGHT	CAUGHT	*prensare*	
	CHAW	CHEW	CHEWD	*manducare*	
	CHIDE	CHID	CHÍDDEN	*reprehendere*	
	CHOOSE	CHOASE	CHÓASEN	*eligere*	
	CLEAUE	CLEFT	CLÓUEN	*se prendre*	

	CLIME	CLOMBE	CLIMED	*scandere*	
	CLEEUE	CLOAUE	CLEFT	*findere*	590
	COUGH	COUGHT	COUGHT	*tussire*	
	CAME	CAME	CUMN	*venire*	
	COMB	KEM'D	KEMB vel KEMPT	*pectere*	
	CREEPE	CREPT	CREPT	*repere, serpere*	
D	DING	DUNG	DING'D	*infligere*	
	DARE	DURST	DARDE	*audere*	
	DEALE	DELT	DELT	*distribuere*	
	DOE	DID	DON	*agere*	
	DRAW	DREW	DRAWNE	*trahere*	
	DRINKE	DRUNKE	DRUNKE vel DRÚNKEN	*bibere*	600
	DRIUE	DROUE	DRÍUEN	*agere, pellere*	
E	EEAT	ATE	EÁTEN	*edere*	
F	FALL	FELL	FALNE	*cadere*	
	FELL	FELLD	FELLD	*arbores cedere*	
	FEEDE	FED	FED	*pascere*	
	FEELE	FELT	FELT	*sentire* vel *palpare*	
	FETCH	FETT	FETCH'T	*apporter*	
	FIGHT	FOUGHT	FOUGHT vel FOUGHTEN	*pugnare*	
	FINDE	FOWND	FOWND	*invenire*	
	[FLY]	FLEW	FLOWNE	*fugere* vel *volare*	610
	FLING	FLUNG	FLUNG	*iacere*	
	FORSAKE	FORSOOKE	FORSAKEN	*abandonner*	
	FRAIGHT	FRAUGHT	FRAUGHT	*onerare navem*	
	FREESE	FROSE	FRÓZEN	*glaciare, congelare*	
G	GETT	GOTT	GÓTTEN	*parare*	
	GIUE	GAUE	GÁUEN	*dare*	
	GOE	WENT	GONE	*ire*	
	GROW	GREW	GROWNE	*crescere*	
H	HANG	HUNG	HÁNGED	*pendere*	
	HEARE	HEARD	HEARD	*audire*	620
	HELPE	HOLPE	HOLPEN vel HELPT	*adiuuare*	
	HIDE	HID	HÍDDEN	*abscondere*	
	HITT	HAT	HÍTTEN vel HITT		
	HOULD	HELD	HÓLDEN vel HELD	*tenere*	
K	KEEPE	KEPT	KEPT	*servare*	
	KNOW	KNEW	KNOWNE	*noscere*	
L	LODE	LADE	LÓDEN	*onerare*	
	LEAD	LED	LED	*ducere*	
	LEAPE	LEPT vel LOAPE	LEPT vel LÓPEN	*saltare*	
	LEAUE	LEFT	LEFT	*relinquere*	630
	LEND	LENT	LENT	*mutuo dare*	
	LY	LAY	LAYD	*iacére*	
	LOOSE	LOOST	LOÓSED	*dissoluere*	
	LOSE	LOST	LOST	*perdere*	
M	MAKE	MADE	MADE	*facere*	
	MEETE	MET	MET	*obviam ire*	
	MELT	MÓLTED	MÓLTEN	*fundere*	
P	PÉRBREAKE	PÉRBROAKE	PÉRBROAKEN	*vomere*	

R	REACH	RAUGHT	REACH'T	*porrigere*	
	RIDE	RID, RODE	RÍDDEN, RODE	*equitare*	640
	RING	RUNG	RUNG	*pulsare nolam*	
	RISE	ROSE	RÍSEN	*surgere*	
	RUN	RAN	RUN	*currere*	
S	SEE	SAW	SEENE	*videre*	
	SEETH	SOD	SÓDDEN vel SOD	*bullire* vel *coquere*	
	SELL	SOULD	SOULD	*vendere*	
	SEND	SENT	SENT	*mittere*	
	SHAKE	SHOOKE	SHÁKEN vel SHOOKE	*quatere*	
	SHEERE	SHORE	SHORNE	*tondere*	
	SHEAD	SHED	SHED	*effundendo perdere*	650
	SHINE	SHONE	SHÍNED vel SHONE	*lucere*	
	SHITE	SHITT	SHÍTTEN vel SHITT	*cacare*	
	SHOOTE	SHOTT	SHOTT vel SHÓTTEN	τοξεύειν	
	SHEW	SHOD	SHOD	*calciamentum induere, calciare*	
	SHRINKE	SHRONK	SHRONK	*retroissir, succumbere onerj*	
	SING	SONG, SANG	SONG	*cantare*	
	SINKE	SUNKE, SANKE	SUNKE	*dissidere*	
	SITT	SATE	SÍTTEN	*sedere*	
	SKIM	SKUM	SKIM'D	*escumer*	659
	SLAY	SLEW	SLAINE	*occidere, necare*	[f.12v]
	SLEEPE	SLEPT	SLEPT	*dormire*	
	SLIDE	SLID	SLÍDDEN	*gliscere*	
	SLING	SLUNG	SLUNG	*funditare*	
	SWELL	SWELD	SWOLNE	*enfler*	
	SMELL	SMELT	SMELT	*olere* vel *olfacere*	
	SMITE	SMITT, SMOTE	SMITTEN	*percutere*	
	SNOW	SNEW'D	SNEW'D, SNOW'D	*ningere*	
	SPEAKE	SPOKE, SPAKE	SPÓKEN	*loquj*	
	SPEND	SPENT	SPENT	*impendere*	
	SPITT	SPAT	SPITTEN, SPITT	*spuere*	670
	SPILL	SPILT	SPILT		
	SPLITT	SPLIT	SPLIT	<*findere*>	
	SPREAD	SPRED	SPRED	*explicare*	
	SPRING	SPRONG	SPRONG	*scaturire*	
	SPIN	{SPAN SPUN}	SPUN	*nere*	
	STAKE	STOOKE	STAK'T	<*mettre argent pour jouer*>	
	STAND	STOOD	STOOD	*stare*	
	STEALE	STOALE	STÓLEN	*furere*	
	STENCH	STENCH'T	STENCHED	*sistere quod fluit*	
	STICKE	STOOCKE	STICKT	*hærere*	680
	STING	STUNG	STUNG	*infigere aculeum*	
	STINKE	STUNKE, STANKE	STUNKE	*male olere*	
	STROW	STREW	STROWNE	*sternere*	
	STRIDE	STRIDD	STRÍDDEN	*diuaricare*	

	STRIKE	STROOKE	STRÍCKEN	*percellere*	
	STRING	STRONG	STRONG	*instruere nervis*	
	STRIUE	STROAUE	STRÍUEN	*contendere*	
	SWEARE	SWOARE	SWORNE	*iurare*	
	SWEATE	{SWETT / SWATT}	SWETT	*sudare*	
	SWEEPE	SWEPT	SWEPT	*vérrere*	690
	SWIM	{SWAM / SWUM}	SWUM	*natare*	
	SWING	SWONG	SWONG	<*brimballer, oscillare*>	
T	TAKE	TOOKE	TAKEN	*accipere*	
	TEACH	TAUGHT	TAUGHT	*docere*	
	TEARE	TOARE	TORNE	<*dechirer*>	
	TELL	TOLD	TOLD	*dicere*	
	THAW	THAW'D vel THEWD	THAW'D	<*degeler*>	
	THINKE	THOUGHT, THAUGHT	THOUGHT	*putare*	
	THRIUE	THROUE	THRÍUEN	*crescere*	
	THROW	THREW	THRÓWEN	*iacere*	700
	TREAD	TRODE	TRÓDEN	*fouller*	
W	WEARE	WOARE	WORNE	<*user en portant*>	
	[WEAUE]	WOUE	WOUEN	*ordir*	
	WEEPE	WEPT	WEPT	*lachrimare*	
	WINDE	WOWND	WOWND		
	WINKE	{WONKE / WINK'T}	WINK'T	*connivere*	
	WIN	{WAN / WUN}	WUN	*vincere*	
	WIPE	WIP'T	WIP'T	*abstergere*	
	WORKE	WROUGHT	WRAUGHT	*laborare*	
	WRING	WRONG	WRING'D	*stringere*	710
	WRITE	{WRITT / WROTE}	WRÍTTEN	*scribere*	
	WRITHE	WRITH'D	WRÍTHEN	*torquere*	
	WHET	WHETTED	WHET	<*acuere, aiguiser*>	

Adverbia.

locj

in loco: HEERÉ *hic*, THERÉ *illic*, WITHÍN *intus*, WITHOÚT *foris*, ÁNY WHERE *usquam*, NÓE-WHERE *nusquam*, WHERE *vbi*, EVERIE WHERE *vbique*, WHERESOÉUER *vbicunque*, ÉITHER WHERE *vtrobique*, ÓTHERWHERE *alibj*, SÓMEWHERE *alicubj*, ABOUÉ *superius*, BELÓW *inferius*, ASIDE *iuxta*. 720

ad locum: HÉTHER *huc*, THÉTHER *illuc*, ÁNY WHETHER *quoquò*, NÓE-WHETHER *neqùd*, WHÉTHER *quo?*, WHÉTHERSOEUER *quolibet*, ÉVERIE WHETHER *quoquò*, SÓMEWHETHER *aliquò*, WITHÓUT *foras*, ÓTHERWHITHER *aliorsum*, V́PWARD *sursum*, DÓWNEWARD *deorsum*, SÍDEWARD *versum latus*, FÓRWARD *antrorsum*, BACKWARD *retrorsum*.

locj — a loco: FROM HENCE vel HENCE *hinc*, FROM THENCE vel THENCE *illinc*, FROM WITHIN *intus*, FROM WITHOUT *foras*, FROM WHENCE vel WHENCE? *vnde?*, WHENCE SOEUER *vndecumque*, FROM ABOUE *supernè*, FROM BELOW *inferne*. 730

per locum: THIS WAIE *hac*, THAT WAIE *illac*, ANYWAY *aliqua*, THE SAME WAY *eadem*, NOEWAY *nequa*.

temporis: WHILE, WHILST *dum*, WHEN *cum*, HOW LONG? *quamdiu?*, LATELY *dudum*, EUEN NOW *iamdudum*, SO OFT *toties*, AS OFT *quoties*, YESTERDAY *herj*, TO DAIE *hodie*, TO MORROW *cras*, EARLY *manè*, LATE *tardè*, NOW *nunc*, OTHERWHILE *alias*, WHILOM *olim*, ALSO *item*, A LITTLE WHILE *paulisper*, A PISSING WHILE, A PATERNOSTER WHILE, A LONG WHILE, A DINNER WHILE, et sic cum plurimis nominibus spatium temporis denotantibus, OFTEN *sæpe*, SELDOME *raro*, DAILIE *quotidie*, HOWRELIE, MONETHLIE, YEARELIE *quotannis*, WEEKELIE, AT ONCE *simul*, etc. 740

Numerj: ONCE *semel*, TWICE *bis*, THRICE *ter*, FOURTIMES *quater*, FIUETIMES *quinquies*, FORTIE TIMES *quadragies*, A HUNDRED TIMES *centies*, A THOUSAND TIMES *millies*. [f.13]

ordinis: FROM HENCEFORWARD *de hinc*, LAST OF ALL *novissime*, FIRST OF ALL *imprimis*, AT LENGTH *demum*.

Interrogandj: WHY? *cur?*, WHEREFORE? *quare?*, BUT WHY? *quin?*, WHY NOT? *quippenj?*, WHY SOE? *quid ita?*, HOW MUCH? *quantum?*, WHENCE? *vnde?*, WHETHER? *quo?* 751

Negandj: NOE *minime*, BY NOE MEANES *nullo modo*, NAY *non*.

Affirmandj: YET *etiam*, SOE *sic*, I *ita*, ALTOGEATHER *prorsus*, TO WITT *nimirum*, APART *seorsim*, MAN BY MAN *viritim*, TOWNE BY TOWNE *oppidatim*.

Dubitandj, vt PERADVENTURE *forsan*, PERCHANCE *forsitan*.

Similitudinis, vt SO *sic*, THUS *ita*, EUENSO *sicutj*, AS IT WERE *tanquam*, EUEN AS *velutj*.

HARDLIE *vix*, SCARCE *vix*, ALMOST *pene*, WELNY *pene*. 760

RATHER *potius*, ESPECIALLIE *potissimum*, NAY RATHER *imo*, NAY *imo*.

TWOFOULD *bifariam*, THREEFOULD *trifariam*, etc., MANY FOULD *plurifariam*.

De Coniunctione.

AND *et*, EITHER *aut*, OR *vel*, NEITHER *neque*, NOR *nec*.

Coniunctionem, *vel*, geminatam sic reddimus: *vel scribit vel dictat*, HEE EITHER WRÍTETH OR DÍCTATETH, *nec scribit nec legit*, HEE NEITHER WRITETH NOR READETH, *et scribit et loquitur* HEE BOTH WRÍTETH AND SPEAKETH.

BUT *sed*, NAY BUT *at*, TRUELIE *vero*, BUT IF *quod sj*. 770

THEREFORE *ergo*, WHEREFORE? *quare?*

FORTHY (poeticum) *igitur*, FOR *nam*, WHEATHER *an*, ALTHOUGH *etsi*, YET *tamen*, NOTWITHSTANDING *non obstante*, AT LENGTH *saltem*, SINCE *quando*, SITHEN *quando*.

De Præpositione.

Apud poetas frequenter postponuntur.

WITH *cum*	BEYOND *trans*	AFTER *post*	
VNTO } *tenus*	WITHIN *intra*	FROM *a, ab*	
VPTO }	WITHOUT *extra, sine*	OF *de*	
TOWARDS *versus*	ABOUT *circum, circa*	OUT OF *e*	780
OUT *ex*	BETWEENE *inter*	FOR *pro*	
TO *ad*	BELOW *infra*	IN *in*	
BEFORE *ante, ob, præ*	OUER AGAINST *iuxta*	ABOUE *super*	
AGAINST *adversus* vel *contra*	BY *per*	BELOW *subter*	
ON THIS SIDE *cis*	NEARE *prope*	VNDER *subter*.	
ON THAT SIDE *trans*	BESIDE *præter*		

Enallage partium. [f.13v]

Substantivum pro adjectivo ut SEA WATER *aqua marina*, FEILD MOUSE *mus agrostis*, WATER RATT *sorex aquatis*, SKY COLOR.
Adjectivum pro substantivo, addendo articulum, ut TAKE THE GOOD AND LEAVE THE BADD *prennez le bon et laissez le mal*; ut apud Latinos *triste lupus stabulis*. 791
Adjectivum pro adverbio, ut HEE SPEAK'S ELOQUENT pro ELOQUENTLY.
Participium activum cum articulo pro nomine, ut THE SPEAKINGE pro THE SPEACH *elocutio*, THE LOOKINGE pro THE LOOKES *aspectus*, THE GOINGE pro THE GATE *gressus*.
Pronomen vice nominis addito articulo, ut THE HEE, THE SHEE.
Verbum infinitum pro nomine, ut TO SPEAKE WELL AND SELDOME IS WISDOME *benè loqui et raro sapientia est*.
Præpositio pro adverbio, ut HEE WENT BEEFORE *præijt*. 800
Præpositio pro verbo, ut I WILL OVER THE RIVER pro I WILL GOE OVER THE RIVER *transito flumen*, quod Græcis familiare. Aliæ fiunt mutationes quas omitto.

De etymologia. [f.14]

Mixtam esse Anglorum linguam non inficias eo, quod et cæteræ regiones faterj necesse habent, quæ incolarum mutationes passæ sunt. Maximam dialecti nostræ partem Germanis debemus, Normannis magnam, à Gallis spolia quædam et verborum manubias retulerunt patres qui olim rerum in Galliis potiti sunt. Ab Italis equitandi, ædificandi aliquot vocabula transtulimus. Hispani gladiandi quædam dederunt. 810 De etymo verborum quæ ab his traximus nullus loquar, quoniam quisque suæ linguæ peritus quæ mutuò accepimus facillimè notaterit. Heic solum voces quæ à Lingua Latina (communj cæterarum thesauro) propiùs absunt tractabo, quæ vero longiùs petitæ fuerint prudens sciensque omitto.

Nomina latina in *tas*, *tas* vertunt in *ty*, ut *veritas* VERITY, *facilitas* FACILITY.
Quæ in *io* apud Latinos finiunt, à genitivis faciunt *ion* ut *institutio* INSTITUTION, ADMINISTRATION, etc.
Ab *ornamentum* ORNAMENT, *auri pigmentum* ORPEMENT, et sic de cæteris. 820
Quæ in *alis* definunt vertuntur in *al* ut *materialis* MATERIAL.
A *fortitudo* FORTITUDE, etc.
Quæ in *bilis* cadunt in *ble* mutantur, ut *detestabilis* DETESTABLE.
Quæ in *ntia* in *nce*, ut à *temperantia* TEMPERANCE, *sapientia*

SAPIENCE, etc.

Verba ut plurimum à participijs passivis Latinis deducta sunt aliquando à themate. [f.14v]

Primæ conjugationis Latinæ plurima à participio, ut à *celebratum*, TO CELEBRATE, *inanimatum* TO INANIMATE, etc.

Quæ verò duplicem consonantem in penultima habent cujuscunque fuerint ordinis, formant nostratia à themate, ut TO COMMEND, CONDEMN, TO DEFEND, TO INTEND, a *commendo*, *condemno*, *defendo*, *intendo*. 830

Quædam etiam ita sese non habentia a themate, ut TO PREPARE, COMPARE, TO NOTE, TO PROVOKE, a *paro*, *noto*, *provoco*.

Secundæ conjugationis plurima à participio, ut TO PROHIBIT, EXHIBIT, REVISE, etc.

Quædam à themate, ut TO CONTAINE, RETAINE, à *teneo*; TO PERSWADE, etc.

In tertia, à participio, ut TO AFFLICT, TO REJECT, DETECT, RESPECT, CONTRACT, EXACT, DEDUCT, etc. 840

Quædam à themate: TO INVADE, DEDUCE, TRADUCE, etc.

Quædam à participiis et gerundiis, ut TO COMPOSE, DISPOSE, EXPOSE, PROPOSE; à gerundiis: TO COMPOUND, EXPOUND, PROPOUND.

Hæc Scoti à themate ducunt, ut TO PROPONE, EXPONE, COMPONE, etc.

In quarta à participijs, ut TO INVEST, PREVENT, TO EXHAUST.

Gallj fere omnia à themate ducunt, nos è contra à participijs, quod argumento esse queat, nos hoc genus vocabula non a Gallis (ut quidam volunt) sed ab ipso fonte petijsse. [f.15] 850

Sexcenta sunt hujuscemodj verba et nomina quæ Latinè scientibus facilè notarj possunt. Verùm nostrates his loquendj formulis nimis abundè utuntur, cum linguæ propriæ analogiam vel turpitèr nesciant vel prudentes negligant.

De compositione.

Mira nobis in hoc genere fœlicitas, quo Gallos, Italos, Hispanos immane quantum superamus.

Sæpè tria coagmentantur nomina, ut A FOOTE-BAL-PLAYER, *qui pila ludit pede*, A TENNIS-COURT-KEEPER *sphæristerij præfectus*, gallicum *tripotier*, A WOOD-COCK-KILLER *un homme qui tue des becasses*. 860

Sæpissimè duo substantiva, ut HAND-KERCHER *mouchoir*, TABLE-NAPKIN *mappa*, TABLE-CLOTH *la nappe*, HEAD-AKE κεφαλαλγία, RAINBOW *areus cœlestis*, EISORE *oculorum dolor*, HART-AKE *cordolium*.

Substantivum cum verbali frequentèr, ut à MAN-SLAYER ἀνδροφόνος, HORSE-STEALER *qui derobe des cheuaux*.

Substantivum cum verbo, ut WOODBIND, WOODSPECK. [f.15v]

Pronomen cum substantivo, ut SELF-LOVE φιλαυτία, SELF-FREEDOM αὐτονομία, SELF-MURDERER αὐτόχειρ.

Verbum cum substantivo, ut PUFF-CHEEKE φυσίγναθος, DRAW-BRIDG *pont leue*, etc. 870

Adjectivum cum substantivo, ut NEWTOWNE νεάπολις, HANDI-CRAFT χειρισοφία.

Adverbium cum participio, ut UP-RISINGE, WEL-SPEAKINGE, DOWNE-LOOKINGE, etc.

Longum esset omnes hujuscemodi formas enumerare nam omnes orationis

partes inter se vicissim cohærent, atque id non sine summa elocutionis elegantia modo non inverecundè votamur.

finis

TEXTUAL NOTES

5 Tonkisio] *n* superimposed over erasure (*m*?)
13 erasure after *et* which seems to be a partially obscured *A*
21 exauditur] inserted as omission in MS.
22 ÁNCIENT.] ÁNCIENT, (with space for more examples)
24 hiulco] superimposed over erasure
33 Gallicum] Gall:
46 Gallicum.] Gall:
66 gallicum.] gall:
70 scribit *ie.*] MS much faded
78 space after BROTHER for one other example
80 space after SPOT for one other example
81 clesmentia] so in MS. consonante] conson.
84 RÉASON.] RÉASON, (with considerable space for more examples)
86 erasure of two or three letters between *vt* and ω.
87 Gallicum.] Gall:
88 PAULSGRAUE] first *u* might be cancelled
95 Gallicum:] Gall.
97 hispanicum,] hisp:
104 Hispanicum.] Hisp:
116 gallicum] gall:
117 solam] originally *solum*, with emending stroke through *u* to make *a*
124 TWELUE.] TWELUE, (with space for more examples)
131 WHO.] WHO, (with space for more examples)
132 OX.] OX, (with space for more examples)
134 graecum.] graec.
137 Italicum,] Ital.
138 masculinum gallicum] mas. gall. FEAST.] FEAST, (with space for more examples)
139 Latinum,] Latin:
140 graecum:] graec.
141 SMOAKE.] SMOAKE, (with space for more examples)
150 Gallicum.] Gall: 151 [in]finitus] finitus
156 emphaseōs] emphaseωs
167 TOTH' may have been set down as two words (but see BYTH' below)
174-5 HOST, HONOR, HONEST] *h* at least partially erased in each word
185 TH'MAN] MS has THE MAN with *e* erased; elsewhere TH'. KNOW TH'MAN] so MS, although KNOWTH['] MAN is intended. Ô TH'MAN] O TH'MAN
200 et] *ut* crossed out, *et* inserted above it
203 consonante,] conso.
207 *mouche*] *e* conjectured; MS bound tightly at this point
228 substantiui] substant.
232 substantiui] sutstan:
235 *ilignum*] *ilignu* (*m* possibly erased)
250-1 MS has τὸ φιλικὸν after LOUELIENESSE as well as FREINDLINESSE (but clearly not a misreading of ἐπαφροδισία)
262 SPITFULL] SPITEFULL (with *e* partially erased)
277 About 1/3 of a page left blank before "de verbalibus"

291 space between FRÉINDLESLY and FÉAREFULLY, as if for gloss (note hastily inserted glosses at 271, 272 above for LIVELYHOOD and BEASTLYHEAD)

324 WITH MEE.] WITH, MEE

325 Ô THEE] O THEE. O'YOU] OYOU. WITH YOU.] WITH, YOU.

327 FROM'ER] FROM 'HER (*h* blotted out)

335 *ve* struck out after *solum*

357 Over a third of a page left blank before heading of Chapter 6

375 emphaticōs] emphaticωs

393 At Scotj aliter] considerably erased

409 perfectum] perfect

426 permissivam] permissi-vam

430 MIGHTST] MIGHST

441 WOULD HAUE BELEIUED] WOUD HAUE BELEIUED.

448-9 LOUÉING . . . MOUÉING] So MS

462 BEE YOU,] BEE YO^U (*u* inserted as correction)

473 MIGHTST] first *t* inserted as correction

531 MISINTERPRET] letter deleted between R and P; final T written over another letter

565 *experge fierj*] *expergefierj*

610 [FLY]] absent in MS

653 τοξεύειν] τὸ ξυειν

703 [WEAUE]] WEARE

740 DINNER] conjectured reading

747 *millies.*] *millies,* (with space for more examples)

751 *quippenj*] *quippe nj*

753 *non.*] *non,* (with space for more examples)

765 *nec.*] *nec,* (with space for more examples)

770 *sj.*] *sj,* (with space for more examples)

771 *quare?*] *quare?,* (with space for more examples)

787 From this point to the end of the MS, penned in another, hybrid hand

804 De Etymologia] title used as well for running head of f.14v and 15

816 latina] inserted

855 De compositione] title also running head for f.15v

869 ἀυτόχειρ] αυτόχειρία. with last two letters deleted

EXPLANATORY NOTES

20 quatuor et **vigintj**: because I/J and U/V were taken to be "the same" letters by most commentators, though Graves's *Grammatica Anglicana* (1594) lists the now traditional twenty-six.

21-2 For the similarity of this passage on the letter *a* to the one in Jonson's *English Grammar*, see Introduction, p.135.

27 BENIAMIN: this entry might be evidence indicative of a relationship with Jonson.

28-32 There is a surface similarity here to Jonson (*Works*, VIII, p.480, 483, 495); however, none of the examples coincides, and Tonkis states the /s/-/k/ distinction rather perfunctorily, without examples. Jonson clearly borrowed both statement and illustrations from Smith's *De Recta* (1568; ed. Deibel, 1913, ff.21v-24) and Mulcaster's *Elementarie* (1582; p.119). Here, too, none of Tonkis's examples coincides, and his mention of Spanish *ch* does not occur in any of the earlier sources. Graves (ed. Funke, 1938, p.7) briefly mentions the /s/-/k/ distinction and the *ch* form. Somehow, one gets the impression that much of this was "common knowledge" derived from the Latin classroom, indifferently transferred to English.

35ff In general, what Tonkis here treats very hastily is given in far more detail in Jonson and Mulcaster, especially the part on the modification of a preceding vowel by the final *e*. There is little coincidence of examples: in the segments on final *-le*, *brittle* occurs in both Jonson and Mulcaster, and *fickle* and *thimble* in Jonson. For the sequence *vel* (not in Jonson) Mulcaster gives the examples *diuel*, *riuel*, *rauel*, *shouel*. (*Rivel* as noun and verb meant "wrinkle"; if Tonkis had consulted Mulcaster, which is by no means proved, he may have been led to the more familiar *drivel*.) Tonkis's note on final *-en* is not echoed in any of the earlier works, and only inferred in Jonson (p.472). The final caution about never sounding *e* as *a* seems to be particularly addressed to a continental audience.

47ff There is little here to compare with the earlier works: Tonkis seems to have omitted entirely *g* + *a*, *o*, *u*. On the other hand, he seems to have been the first to notice the special quality of the combination *ng*. Of his illustrations, *ginger* appears in both Mulcaster and Jonson, and *give* in Jonson; on the "Italian *gu*." cf. Jonson (p.484): "And in *Guin*. *guerdon*. *languish*. *anguish*. where it speakes the *Italian ġu*." *Guin* and *guerdon* occur in Mulcaster, but not the two examples in Tonkis. Tonkis seems to be alone in hearing the "gutteral sound" of *gh*; cf. Dobson, I, p.315.

61 Cf. Mulcaster, p.121: "Somtime it is writen, without anie force in vtterance, as in manie enfranchised words, as, *honest*, *humble*, *hoste*, *hostice*. Where the vowell after h, is heard, as if there went no aspiration before." Substantially the same is in

Jonson, p.495, save for the omission of the example *hostess*. The other passages on *h* in Tonkis are too vague for further comparison.

64-5 *g* Italicum: the concept occurs in Jonson (p.475), as do the examples *jest* and *joy*. These examples, plus *jet*, occur also in Mulcaster, p.115.

66-7 Jonson (p.472) has the example *incident*, and Mulcaster (p.114), *coincident*, but both in a much more detailed setting. Here Tonkis is worse than perfunctory, if that is possible.

71 Cf. Jonson (p.487): "K, Which is a Letter the *Latines* never acknowledged, but only borrow'd in the word *Kalendæ*. They used *qu*. for it. Wee found [*sic*. ? sound] it as the *Greeke* κ and as a necessarie Letter it precedes, and followes all *Vowells* with us. It goes before no *Consonants* but *n*. as in *knave*. *knel*. *knot*. &c." The last, including the example *knave*, is in Mulcaster (p.121).

76-82 Though Jonson's discussion (p.475) differs completely from Tonkis in that, following Mulcaster, he tries to distinguish systematically between the different kinds of sounds, the following examples do co-occur: *open*, *over*, *note*, *brother*, *love*, *prove*. Of these, only *love* appears in Mulcaster, pp.115-16.

83-6 Cf. Jonson (p.476): "In the last *Syllabes* before *n*. and *w*. it frequently looseth [i.e., becomes /ə/]: as in *persòn*, *actiòn*, *willòw*, *billòw*." Jonson used the *grave* to mark a "flat" vowel; Tonkis's marking does not follow this system. Earlier (p.475) Jonson used *sow* as an example, among others, of "diphthongs" in *ow*; it occurs in a similar list in Mulcaster (p.115). *Peason* is the obsolete or dialectal plural of *pease*, now *pea*.

87 On the apparent variation of the illustrations, see Dobson, I, p.314.

88 PAULSGRAUE: usually *Palsgrave*; Count Palatine.

89 The example *Phillip* occurs in Mulcaster (p.123) and Jonson (p.496).

92 Cf. Jonson (p.491): "Sometime it inclineth to z. as in these, *Muse*. *use*. *rose*. *nose*. *wise*." A similar passage is in Mulcaster (p.122), but without the illustration *muse*. See also Graves (p.8): "Perperam profertur S. pro z. ut *az*, *iz*, *wize*, pro *as*, *is*, *wise*." Tonkis and Graves lack a good bit of material on initial and final *s*, which occur in the other commentaries.

93 Cf. Jonson (p.496): "*Sh* Is meerely *English*; and hath the force of . . . the French *ch* . . . ." None of the examples coincides.

96 Cf. Smith (f.33v), speaking of the Old English *thorn* and *eth*: "Nam illud Saxonum [eth] respondet illi sono quem vulgaris Graeca lingua facit quando pronuntiant suum [delta], aut Hispani *d*

literam suam melliorem, vt cum veritatem *verdad* appellant. Spina autem illa videtur mihi referre prorsus Graecorum Θ." Jonson (p. 496) adapted much of this, though without the Spanish illustration.

97 In Jonson (p.496) *lengthen*, *strengthen*, *loveth* are among the examples of *th* sounded like the Greek *theta*, and *this*, *that*, *then*, *thence*, *those*, *bathe*, *bequeath*, make up the entire list of words illustrative of *delta* or Spanish *d*. In Smith (f.32v), *thou*, *those*, *these* (spelled "thës"), *that*, *this*, and *brother* are among the words illustrative of a *th* spelling.

99 METHÉGLEN: (sometimes *metheglin*) a beverage, once very popular, of honey and water, usually fermented; mead.

103 SITHE: probably a variant of *sigh*, or equally of *scythe*.

108 PULE: to cry, whine.

109-15 Cf. Mulcaster (p.116): "It is vsed consonantlike also as well as i, when it leadeth a sounding vowell in the same syllab, as *vantage*, *reuiue*, *deliuer*. or the silent e, in the end, as *beleue*, *reproue*." In the like passage in Jonson, though garbled (p.479), the example *love* occurs.

117ff This account of the pronunciation of ME /y:/ has no counterpart in Mulcaster, Graves, or Jonson, and the remarks in Smith lead to a somewhat different conclusion; see Dobson, I, 315; II, 699-713.

123 TWIBILL: a two-edged axe, mattock, battle-axe.

131 In his passage on initial *wh*, which he analyzes as /hw/ (p.479), Jonson lists as examples *what*, *which*, *wheele*, *whether*.

132 In considerably longer, and interrelated, passages, Smith (f.31) and Jonson (p.492) share the example *box*, and Mulcaster (p.123) cites the anomalous *oxen*.

133 Jonson (pp.479-80), Mulcaster (p.117), and Smith (f.18) all go into considerable detail about this initial semi-vowel.

134 This Greek pronunciation example is also in Jonson (p.492) and Smith (f.31v). The OED cites *ezod*, *izzard*, and *uzzard* as variants of *zed*, but not *ezard*.

136-43 Mulcaster (pp.118-19) listed twelve "diphthongs" (actually digraphs); Jonson (pp.498-9) cut it back to nine. Of the latter, *oo* and *ui* are not in Tonkis, but *ae* and *oa* are not in Jonson or Mulcaster; both agree that *oa* (and *ee*) are orthographically unnecessary. Smith (f.15) includes æ ("diphthongus Latina" [sic]) as a somewhat modified form of *ai*. Only Smith includes directions for pronunciation, but the directions in Tonkis are so brief that any connection would be impossible to prove. However, Smith calls *eu* "diphthongum Graecum" and of *oi* he says, "Gallis frequentissima,

ita nobis est rarissima" (f.16). Of the examples given, *way*, *dew*, *toy*, *boy*, are in Jonson; and these, plus *mau* ("stomachus"), are in Smith. WHAY is probably *whey*.

150-60 On the striking similarities between this passage and that in Jonson, see the Introduction, pp.135-6.

171 ὁ͡ὔνος: so in MS, apparently to show elision; normally ὁ ὔνος.

184ff This declension of the English noun has no direct counterpart in any of the other English grammars: Jonson and Graves give no declension at all, and Bullokar, *Pamphlet for Grammar* (1586) rather futilely lists the nouns in Latin case order without article or preposition.

203-9 Cf. Graves (p.9): "Anomalia vero multiplex est. ut *Man*, *men*: *Goose*, *geese*: *Cowe*, *kine*: *Oxe*, *oxen*: *Childe*, *children*: *Tooth*, *teeth*: *Foote*, *feete*: *Brother*, *brethren*: *Louse*, *lise*: *Mouse*, *Mice*: huc vertentia f. in v. ut *Staffe*, *Staves*: *Beefe*, *beeves*: *Life*, *liues*: *Sheafe*, *Sheaues*: *Theefe*, *theeues*: *wife*, *wives*: *Knife*, *knives*." Obviously, much of the similarity arises from the limited examples in closed categories. However, the Cambridge connection of both Tonkis and the *Grammatica Anglicana* must be borne in mind.

213-16 Cf. Graves (p.10): "Faecundissimus hic omnium adjectivorum ortus est, in *lesse*. cuius substantivique connexu fiunt. ut *faithlesse*, *toothlesse*, *wifelesse*, *horselesse*. id est, *without faith*, *teeth*, *wife*, *horse*." Except for a brief mention later of nouns formed from adjectives in *-ness* and adverbs from adjectives in *-ly*, this is all that Graves has on derivational affixes.

240-5 Jonson (pp.508-9) lists *-ish* as a diminutive suffix for adjectives. The sole coinciding example is *white/whitish*.

270-2 BEASTLYHEAD: As synonymous with *beasthood* as well as *beastliness*, attested by two OED citations, 1579 (Spenser) and 1616.

284-6 On the dubious nature of this statement, see Introduction, note 14.

292 FREINDLILY: OED has four citations dating from 1680; though awkward, the form is nonetheless analogically sound. On GOODLILY, and STEALINGLY in the next line, see Introduction, p.132.

300ff The example *learned*, *learneder*, *learnedest* occurs in Jonson (p.509), and neither he nor Graves nor Bullokar (not to mention Tonkis) gives any directions for distinguishing between the use of the inflected comparison and the periphrastic with *more/most*. Citations abound throughout the 17th century to indicate a general state of flux.

313ff A longer, more systematic section on diminutives appears

in Jonson (pp.508-9). Examples which coincide are *capon, caponet; bull, bullock; goose, gosling; duck, duckling; dear, darling; Richard, Dick; William, Will.*

320 STARE: a bird of the genus *sturnus*; starling.

321ff De Pronomine: This presentation is far more complete as to exposition, and bears no resemblance to the discussion in the other grammars of the time. However, here, as elsewhere in his presentation of the parts of speech, Tonkis shows no interest in definitions or similar linguistic niceties.

323 Demonstrativa sunt I, THOU, HE, SHE: a concept strongly influenced by the traditional Latin grammar, in that *ille* and *is* could be used either as demonstratives or as personal pronouns. At the time, the grammatical concepts *relative* and *demonstrative* were considered synonymous. See Michael, p.328ff.

338-47 Jonson mentions only relative *which*; Graves, *who* and *which*, though the latter discussion is somewhat confusing (p.12). Only Bullokar, like Tonkis, gives relatives *who, which, that.* Jonson denied place to *that* as a relative pronoun, according to Drummond of Hawthorndon, but in practice he used it often enough. (See "Conversations with Jonson", in Jonson's *Works*, I, p.149.)

349-55 Cf. Jonson (p.511): "Which distinctions [of the proper spelling of the genitives of nouns ending in sibilants], not observed, brought in first the monstrous Syntaxe of the *Pronoune, his*, joyning with a Noune, betokening a *Possessor*; as, the *Prince* his *house*; for, the *Princis house*."

354 POLIBIUS'US See Introduction, p.133.

360-1 Tonkis here seems to be an echo of Graves in insisting on one conjugation, lumping all departures from the preterit in *-ed* into the "anomalous" category. Bullokar had three conjugations, and the systematic Jonson, four.

372ff Although Tonkis took the schemata of Lily as his model, his nine separate tenses are by far the largest number in any single English grammar of that time. His dependence on a Latin model is likewise shown by his artificial use of all six possible moods: indicative, imperative, infinitive, optative, potential, and subjunctive. See Michael, pp.398-9, 433-5.

385ff Tonkis seems to have been the first commentator on English grammar to make such a clear distinction between *will* and *shall*. Bullokar, Graves, and Jonson all seem to indicate that *will* and *shall* were used interchangeably. Despite all the studies of recent years, the historical situation is by no means clear; see J. Taglicht, "The Genesis of the Conventional Rules for the Use of *Shall* and *Will*", *English Studies* 51 (1970) pp.193-213.

393 At Scotj aliter . . .: this is difficult to verify; from

the 17th century the interchanging of the "proper" use of *shall* and *will* has popularly been considered Scottish, Northern, provincial, and non-British English usage. However, Hume, *On the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue* (c.1617), mentions and makes use only of *will* in his description of verb forms and tenses.

399 *vnus . . . orco*: Cf. "juvenum primos tot miserit Orco?" (*Aeneid*, IX, 785).

417 *nec . . . regem*: *Georgics*, I, 36.

420ff This seems to be the earliest attempt to distinguish between the usage of *may* and *can*. The other grammars treat of them as anomalous or auxiliary forms, but not as markers of a "potential mood". As with *shall/will*, the historical development of these forms needs thorough review.

442 It should be noted that Tonkis is a sufficiently able observer of his native tongue to avoid the Latin trap which Graves and Bullokar blindly blundered into: the positing of a "past pluperfect" infinitive, "to had loved".

561ff Both Graves and Jonson have long lists of irregular verbs, the latter being much more systematically presented. Omitting from the comparison occurrences in Tonkis of variants of Jonson's "first conjugation" (formations of the past in /t/, as *cough*, *loose*, *stench* (i.e., *stanch/staunch*), *wipe*; formation of the preterit in /t/ from base forms ending in /d/, as *bend*, *build*, *send*; variants of regular /d/ preterits, as *smell*, *spill*; and invariables, as *split*, *whet*;) plus *fell* ("chop down") and prefixed verbs, as *arise*, *awake*, *backbite*, *perbreak*, we find that Tonkis has far the larger list, though Jonson may not have been working for comprehensiveness. Verbs not included in either Jonson or Graves are *behold*, *bereave*, *chaw*, *comb*, *ding*, *deal*, *fetch*, *freeze*, *melt*, *shit*, *show*, *skim*, *sling*, *swell*, *spit*, *stake*, *strow*, *string*, *thaw*, *writhe*. Six more are in Tonkis and Graves, but not Jonson, whereas 27 are in Jonson and Tonkis, but not Graves. On the other hand, *read*, *will* (*wolle* in Jonson), *shall* (*sholle* in Jonson), *seek*, *owe*, *may*, *be*, occur in Jonson and Graves, but not Tonkis. In addition, *dread*, *shread*, *speed*, *crow*, *quite* ("quit"), *hight* ("name"), *grind*, *hew*, *mow*, *mean*, are in Jonson, and *steep*, *weet* (? = *wit*), *have*, are in Graves, but not the others. The overall inference is that if there was any borrowing going on, it was from Tonkis's longer, but unorganized list to Jonson's systematic discussion.

565 AWOKE: OED lists *awook* as a 13th-century form; it is not mentioned in Wright's *English Dialect Grammar* or *Dictionary*. However, the simplex *wooke* is listed up to the 16th century.

585 CHAW: according to OED, "a by-form of *chew* . . . very common in the 16th-17th c." In any case, the preterit would seem to have been *chawed/chewed*.

588 CLEAUE ("to cling"): preterit *cleft* is attested by two

early 17th-century citations in OED, but there is no attestation for participial *cloven*.

589 CLOMBE: used in the 17th century as an affectedly archaic form; the usual preterit was *climbed* or dialectal *clum* /kləm/.

592 CAME: there is no attestation for present tense *came*; perhaps (though the order here is not rigidly alphabetical) *come* is intended.

593 COMB: *kembed*, *kempt* were common variants of *combed*, the latter surviving in *unkempt*, but participial *kemb* is not attested elsewhere.

595 DING'D: occasionally found as a Southern variant of participial *dung* in the 16th and 17th centuries.

604 FELL: probably included to differentiate from *fall*.

616 GÁUEN: not clearly attested in OED except as *geaven* (Wriothesley, *Chronicles*, 1538).

623 HAT: listed in OED as the Scottish and Northern preterit of *hit* from the 17th century, and still attested as such in Wright's *English Dialect Grammar*. It might be noted that Tonkis twice explicitly mentions Scots usage. (See 11.393, 845; and cf. Notes to 11.547, 557.)

624 HÓLDEN: according to OED, "in the 16th c. [participial] *holden* began to be displaced by *held* from the past tense, and is now archaic, but preserved by its use in legal and formal language."

627 LADE: existed as a parallel form to *load*, but not as a preterit of it. The normal preterit was *loaded/laded*.

629 LEAPE: both preterit *loape* and participial *lopen* exist as Scottish and Northern forms.

638 PÉRBREAKE: vomit, spew forth; parallel form for *parbreak*. The preterit and participial forms seem to have been *per-* or *parbreaked*, not those listed here analogical to *break*, *broke*, *broken*.

639 RAUGHT: according to OED, "continued in general use down to c. 1600, and was frequently employed for half a century later, but is now only archaic, or dialectal in the forms *raucht* (Scottish), *rought* (Lanc., Chesh., Staff.), and *raught* (West Midlands)."

659 SKUM: the form *scum* developed side by side with *skim*, and possibly preceded it, but in either case, the preterit was usually *scummed/skimmed*.

676 STAKE: the only instance of a preterit in the OED, in the sense "to gamble", is the relatively late (1802) *staked*. *Stooke* is

not attested.

679 STENCH: the form *stanch/staunch* was far commoner.

706 WONKE: according to OED, "Examples of a strong conjugation in English (past tense *wank*, *wonk*) are very rare."

772 FORTHY: this word, and its parallel *forthon*, were archaisms by the mid-16th century. Likewise for *sithen* (line 774) and its reduced form *sith*.

787 Enallage: literally "exchange" or "interchange"; as a grammatical term, the substitution, as here, of one part of speech for another.

792 *Triste . . . stabulis*: "Triste lupus stabulis, maturis frugibus impres,/ Arboribar venti." *Eclogues*, III, 80.

820 ORPEMENT: also *orpiment*, *auripigment*, trisulphide of arsenic, called "yellow arsenic" or "the king's yellow".

867ff For comment on the exact parallel of this passage with a marginal note in Jonson, see Introduction, p.136.

867 WOODBIND: common variant of *woodbine*. WOODSPECK: a woodpecker; the word actually derives from *wood* plus *speck*, *speight*, *spite*, "woodpecker", and thus the second element is not etymologically a verb.

870 PUFF-CHEEKE: not in OED; the Greek is an allusion to *puff-cheek*, the name of a frog in *Batrachomyomachia*, 56.

EDITOR'S NOTE

We plan to print an edition by Professor Cook of John Evelyn's *English Grammer* in *Leeds Studies in English* Vol. XIV.